

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OFFICIALS ASSERT UNITED STATES IS TRYING TO WEAKEN COSTA RICA CHIEF

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last October 20, our colleague from Florida, Mr. FASCELL, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, brought before us a resolution congratulating President Oscar Arias on his receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize. In the House, there were only 18 votes in opposition to the resolution. Apparently, there were more votes against it downtown.

Stephen Kinzer's article in Sunday's New York Times, August 7, 1988, gives disturbing evidence of the extent to which some U.S. officials have worked to undermine President Arias. The complete text of Mr. Kinzer's article follows:

OFFICIALS ASSERT UNITED STATES IS TRYING TO WEAKEN COSTA RICA CHIEF

(By Stephen Kinzer with Robert Pear)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA, August 4.—Publicly, the United States has praised President Oscar Arias Sanchez of Costa Rica for leading the quest for peace in Central America. But privately, Reagan Administration officials have taken steps to embarrass and undermine him, and have derisively referred to him as "the laureate," according to political leaders here and in Washington.

Reagan Administration officials say the Costa Rican President has been naive in his assessment of the Sandinista Government of Nicaragua and has formed a working alliance with Democrats in Congress to halt shipments of weapons to the Nicaraguan rebels.

A PRIZE FOR DEFIANCE?

Mr. Arias won the Nobel Peace Prize last October for his efforts to end the fighting in Central America. A top State Department official said this week: "He won the prize for de-funding the contras and taking an anti-American stance. It was largely a prize for defying the United States."

Officials in Washington and San José said friction between the two countries had shown itself in several ways:

The Costa Rican Ambassador to the United States, Guido Fernández, was replaced after Administration officials and Republican members of Congress complained that he had lobbied against President Reagan's proposals to send weapons to the contras. Mr. Arias asked Congress to halt such assistance and "give peace a chance" when he visited Washington last September.

Mr. Arias has ordered his border guards and police officers to arrest contras operating from Costa Rican territory. In 1986, he ordered the closure of an airstrip built secretly in Costa Rica by associates of Oliver L. North, who was then on the staff of the National Security Council. The airstrip was

to have become part of the United States' clandestine network for supplying the contras. Mr. Arias also upset American officials this year when he ordered senior contra leaders living in Costa Rica to leave the country or drop out of the contra leadership.

The United States successfully demanded that Mr. Arias's closest confidant, John Blehl, be dismissed from his position with the United Nations Development Program. American officials say he violated the rules for international civil servants by lobbying in Washington against aid to the contras.

American officials provided information that led to the arrest of one of Mr. Arias's campaign supporters on charges of laundering drug money. And American officials helped publicize an audit charging that millions of dollars of American aid had been mismanaged in Costa Rica.

Jose S. Sorzano, who worked on the staff of the National Security Council until June of this year, described the view of many White House officials. "Publicly, the Reagan Administration refers to Arias in a cordial, friendly fashion," he said, "but actually, privately, they have a low opinion of him that borders on despising him. And Arias reciprocates. He has a low opinion of the Reagan Administration."

The tension between the two countries dramatizes the Reagan Administration's difficulty in winning support for its policies in Central America. Costa Rica, the region's oldest, most stable democracy, and Guatemala rebuffed the United States this week when Secretary of State George P. Shultz asked them to join in a strong denunciation of Nicaragua.

When Mr. Shultz visited Costa Rica on July 1, he praised Mr. Arias as a man "admired throughout the world for his noble efforts on behalf of peace."

But Robert W. Kagan, a former aide to Elliott Abrams, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, said, "Arias, more than any other Latin leader, single-handedly undid U.S. policy in Nicaragua."

Mr. Kagan said that when Mr. Arias won the Nobel Prize, "all of us who thought it was important to get aid for the contras reacted with disgust, unbridled disgust."

Though Mr. Arias has enemies in Washington, he also has important friends and admirers, including Jim Wright, the Speaker of the House, and Senator Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut and chairman of the Foreign Relations subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

AN ANTI-ARIAS DRIVE: PERCEPTION OR REALITY?

Mr. Arias is extremely circumspect when publicly discussing his relations with the United States. But friends and associates of the Costa Rican President say he believes the United States is waging a campaign against him.

"I don't think there is a real conspiracy against Oscar by the top Reagan Administration people," said Daniel Oduber, who was President of Costa Rica from 1974 to 1978. "But some lower-ranking American officials, both in Washington and in Central America, are making his life difficult. They

want to impose their will on him. They want him to act in support of their strategic goals in Central America, rather than in the best interests of Costa Rica."

Fernando Zumbado, Costa Rica's Minister of Housing, said: "It's obvious that there are people, Americans as well as Costa Ricans, who have set out to weaken Oscar. I have the very strong feeling that efforts are being made to undermine him."

American officials said the United States Government had no plans to provide money to opponents of Mr. Arias, and the American Ambassador to Costa Rica, Deane R. Hinton, said he was "horrified" by disclosure of a United States Government audit showing Costa Rican mismanagement of American aid because it was "filled with inaccuracies." He denied that the United States had been working to weaken Mr. Arias.

"We don't agree with everything he does by a long shot," Mr. Hinton said in an interview. "I encourage him to do or not to do things. That's my job. But a systematic campaign? Certainly not."

"QUARRELS WITH BROTHERS TEND TO BE MORE BITTER"

"Costa Rica and the United States are both genuine and successful democracies, but their leaders don't see eye to eye," said a European ambassador in San José. "We're seeing that quarrels with brothers tend to be more bitter than those with distant relations."

Mr. Arias was elected in February 1986 and had his first conflict with Washington even before he was inaugurated. He turned down a State Department request that he grant asylum to Ferdinand E. Marcos, the President of the Philippines, who was later granted asylum in Hawaii.

Soon after taking office in May 1986, Mr. Arias began working on a regional peace plan designed to end armed conflicts and encourage democracy in Central America. On Aug. 7, 1987, a version of the plan was signed by Mr. Arias and the Presidents of Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala.

One of the most important provisions was a ban on the use of territory in Central America by "irregular forces" seeking to overthrow other regimes in the area. If observed, this provision would have crippled President Reagan's policy toward Nicaragua by ending the use of Honduran and Salvadoran bases to aid the contras. Neither Honduras nor El Salvador actually stopped aiding the guerrillas, but after the Arias plan was signed, they came under more criticism for doing so.

The Arias plan also provided an argument for members of Congress opposed to the contras. Many said they were voting against contra aid bills backed by the Administration because such aid would subvert the plan.

"The Arias plan," Mr. Sorzano said, "gave liberal Democrats in the House an opportunity to kill the Reagan program by chanting, 'Give peace a chance.'"

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

THE BIEHL CASE: VICTIM OR MEDDLER?

Those who support Mr. Reagan's position on aid to the contras were infuriated when they heard that Mr. Biehl, one of Mr. Arias's top advisers, was lobbying against it.

Mr. Biehl wrote many of Mr. Arias's speeches and helped formulate many of his policies, including the regional peace plan. He also directed the quiet campaign that helped Mr. Arias win the Nobel Prize.

In June 1987, Senator Robert W. Kasten, Jr. of Wisconsin, the ranking Republican on the foreign operations panel of the Appropriations Committee, wrote a letter to the United Nations Development Program complaining about Mr. Biehl's activities and suggesting that his continued employment might endanger United States contributions to the program.

Mr. Kasten's letter was published in *La Nación*, the leading Costa Rican newspaper, and Mr. Biehl was forced to quit the program. Costa Rican officials assert that the letter was made available by the State Department to embarrass Mr. Arias. State Department officials neither confirm nor deny the suggestion.

After leaving his United Nations post, Mr. Biehl continued to advise Mr. Arias and remained critical of the contras and the Reagan Administration. American officials pressed Mr. Arias to dismiss him, and in June, Mr. Biehl announced that he was leaving Costa Rica to return to his native Chile.

"President Arias has had the courage, or perhaps the arrogance, to confront Reagan, to tell him, 'I know Central America better than you and your advisers,'" Mr. Biehl said.

Aides to Mr. Arias said he was distressed to lose the man widely viewed as his alter ego.

Mr. Biehl is not the only member of the Arias inner circle to have come under attack from Washington. Ambassador Fernández was recalled to Costa Rica in March after Mr. Abrams and other Administration officials said he had been lobbying against aid to the contras.

Mr. Fernández, now Costa Rica's Minister of Information, denied the assertions. He said he had visited Capitol Hill only at the request of members of Congress to transmit Mr. Arias's views regarding Central America.

ARIAS'S GOAL: "FRIENDSHIP, NOT SLAVERY"

Several leaders of the National Liberation Party, to which Mr. Arias belongs, suggested in interviews that the United States was waging a campaign against him.

"The political reality is that Oscar Arias believes the United States is after him," said a former Cabinet minister. "In the party, the belief exists that there is a strong United States effort directed against Arias."

Although Mr. Arias would make no direct comment, friends said a newspaper column published July 4 was intended as a message to the United States.

"My opposition to Washington's policy has surprised some people," he wrote. "I propose to show the entire world that a well-founded friendship between two brother peoples allows us to agree at times but also to differ; that when the small one always does what the big one wants, that is not friendship, but slavery."

"I propose to show the world that, small and poor as my Costa Rica may be, we can have our own ideas, independent judgment, autonomy and dignity."

BALLISTIC MISSILE PROLIFERATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been increasing recognition of the threat posed to global security by ballistic missile proliferation.

While this threat alone is great, we must recognize that it is linked to a larger problem—the quest by many Third World nations for nuclear weapons. The stakes are higher than ever before, and nowhere is the risk of future disaster greater than in South Asia.

Both Pakistan and India have ballistic missile development programs. In late April, it was reported that Pakistan test-fired a short-range missile capable of carrying nuclear weapons. India is far ahead of Pakistan in its ballistic missile program, possessing missiles with ranges which cover the whole of Pakistan.

There has been far too little attention paid to the consequences of these dangerous trends. The introduction into South Asia of nuclear-capable ballistic missiles by two rival nations which have fought three wars in the last 41 years and continue to have tense relations would be disastrous. Ballistic nuclear missiles in either country would allow virtually no warning time of an attack, creating enormous pressures for a preemptive strike during a crisis. And yet this scenario could become reality in the not-so-distant future.

Our half-hearted efforts have failed to stop Pakistan from obtaining the technology and the materials to make a nuclear bomb. That has had a predictable effect on previously quiescent nuclear weapons-related aspects of India's nuclear program. The issue now arises as to whether we will work to contain this next phase of nuclear armament by nations like Pakistan and India.

The Missile Technology Control Regime established last year by the United States, Canada, France, England, Italy, West Germany, and Japan was a good first step; but it falls far short of providing a solution to the problem. We must expand our efforts to control ballistic missile proliferation.

First, we must address the fact that the regime has been undermined by the continued unrestricted sale of ballistic missiles by the Soviet Union and China. China's actions have been particularly troublesome. Many of us argued in 1985 against the United States-China Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation because of China's history of irresponsible nuclear material and nuclear technology exports. Now the problem has entered a new dimension as Chinese ballistic missile exports have increased in many regions of the world. China's reported assistance to Pakistan's nuclear program has apparently carried over to Pakistan's missile program. We must convince the Chinese and the Soviets to comply with and join the ballistic missile control regime.

Second, we have to practice what we preach. We must adhere strictly to ballistic technology controls and not place short-term policy concerns above our long-term interests.

For example, pursuing closer ties with India through expanded technology agreements is a good policy, but we must be careful not to indirectly help any ballistic missile development efforts in the process.

Third, there needs to be greater emphasis on the link between the nuclear nonproliferation regime and the ballistic missile proliferation regime. We must recognize that the pursuit of the capability to produce nuclear bombs will be complemented by the desire for ballistic missiles to deliver those bombs. Given this, our policies must be comprehensive if they are to be effective.

Fourth, and most important, we must have a renewed commitment to halting the spread of nuclear weapons and addressing the damage already done. Over the past 8 years, an issue which should have been at the top of our foreign policy agenda has been pushed aside in the pursuit of narrow, short-term objectives.

But this problem won't go away. If we ignore the ballistic missile dimension of nuclear proliferation as we have ignored the spread of nuclear bomb technology, we risk seeing the advent of first-strike nuclear weapons in already tense areas of the Third World.

Our objective should be to foster an end to the development of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, to reduce existing stockpiles of ballistic missiles in the Third World, and to gain worldwide adherence to full-scope safeguards on all nuclear facilities. This objective should be clearly stated and energetically pursued; other, shorter term objectives should be weighed with an eye to how they affect this overriding priority, and not vice versa.

It would be a tragic irony if, at the same time that the United States and the Soviet Union inaugurate a regime eliminating intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe, a nuclear arms race involving similar weapons in the Third World is begun due to our own inaction.

DETROIT CITY COUNCIL PRESIDENT HENDERSON ON DRUGS IN DETROIT

HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Detroit City Council President Erma Henderson testified at a Subcommittee on Criminal Justice field hearing on drug abuse.

I would like to commend Ms. Henderson's testimony to my colleagues' attention. While Detroit has a very severe drug problem, it is no more severe than the problems in many large cities of this Nation. The violence, crime, and social upheavals caused by drug abuse is tearing apart the fabric of our urban lives. The city of Detroit is addressing the problem the best that it can, but, as Ms. Henderson testifies, it cannot solve it alone. Our cities need strong Federal assistance. We in Congress can provide this assistance, if we can gain the cooperation of the executive branch. Tomorrow when we vote on the Omnibus Drug Initiative Act, we will have the opportunity to provide this much-needed leadership. It is my sin-

cere hope that we will have the courage to rise to the challenge.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF DETROIT CITY COUNCIL
PRESIDENT ERMA HENDERSON

As we all know, the rise in the abuse of cocaine, its derivative known as crack, heroin, and prescription drugs is rampant in the City of Detroit and the nation as a whole, with cocaine continuing to be the number one illegal drug of abuse in both the Detroit metropolitan area and statewide.

As stated by Congressman James H. Scheuer, N.Y., during the hearings of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, "The current administration has not shown the leadership needed to combat the Nation's drug abuse problem." To "Just Say No" is not good enough! It has been documented time and time again through testimony that the same drugs that are killing and incapacitating our citizenry are being, effortlessly, brought into this country by the administration in order to accommodate international schemes and bartering. In conjunction, the amounts of money cut from the federal budget that could have been used to fight this so called "war on drugs"; can lead one to believe that there is an overt conspiracy to foster the incapacitation of our American citizenry. These events, whether real or imagined, have wrecked havoc upon the City of Detroit and other urban areas.

The costs of directly countering this epidemic through treatment, education, and law enforcement, is staggering; as are the related costs, involving the violent deaths, robberies, burglaries, youth shooting, muggings, shoplifting, car thefts, and rising insurance rates; to name a few.

Recent reported estimates from the Detroit Police Department indicate that 50,000 people from Detroit and the adjacent suburbs are hooked on crack cocaine alone. Because the drug is cheap it has become an entrepreneurial drug, with hundreds of small time dealers getting into the business. It has been stated that a pre-teen through high school age dropout can earn \$200-\$400 a day in profits from sales, where a high school student working full-time at a fast food operation won't take home that much in a week. These numbers alone place Detroit's illegal drug business at close to \$1,000,000,000 (one billion) a year in sales, ahead of the majority of retail sales outlets in the area.

In contrast, the City of Detroit spend only \$12.6 million (FY 87-88) in the areas of treatment and prevention, with approximately \$8.8 million of that figure coming from Federal coffers through the State of Michigan grant processes. It is estimated that there are more than 1000 "crack houses" within the City of Detroit. The City of Detroit does not have the additional revenues needed to combat the growing increase of these operations. I will not begin to elaborate on the increased revenues needed for the jail space that this epidemic has generated, but as we know, it costs more to incarcerate than to treat and educate!

Death, jail or recovery are the only options for drug addicts; the latter is the least likely. Recovery from drug addiction requires professional treatment. For individuals fortunate enough to have the benefit of private medical insurance, treatment is available. An indigent seeking treatment in our city is in trouble. Access to the appro-

prate treatment is pitifully restricted due to the lack of revenues and appropriate facilities. And as you well know, the trickle down theory has not worked very well in Detroit.

A 1986 study conducted by Wayne State University's Addiction Research Institute estimated total 1985 expenditures for the treatment of substance abuse-related disorders among Detroit residents at a minimum value of \$144 million. Of that total, approximately \$14 million was State funded.

Concurrently, emergency room admissions and deaths attributed to cocaine, its derivatives, and other narcotics have increased. The Detroit Health Department's Central Diagnostic and Referral Service Unit reported that in the October-December 1986 quarter, substance abuse treatment programs handled 786 patients, with cocaine the primary drug in 12% of the cases and crack cocaine the primary drug in 35%. During the next quarter, the Service Unit reported 1,114 patients, with 2% primarily abusing cocaine and 40% abusing crack. The number of persons requesting treatment have increased steadily. It is now reported that it takes the Service Unit anywhere from four to six weeks to locate a treatment facility for abusers. The Service unit saw a projection of 375 treatment patients exceeded by 68%. Of the 547 requests for service, only 334 were processed—and just 325 were actually referred to treatment. In 1987 there were approximately 4,770 requests for service, a 34% increase from the previous year. The cause being the lack of revenues to support the number and quality of treatment and prevention programs. The line of drug addicts waiting for treatment in Detroit is long and getting longer.

There is not one publicly funded treatment facility in the City of Detroit for youth! Documentation and national media reports have substantiated the fact that the ages of addicts and first time users have been increasingly dropping. Our preteenage youth are now targets and victims of this vile epidemic. The one facility that did exist for youth closed its doors because the levels of funding did not keep up with the increased demand for in-house treatment services. The need for money earmarked for this area is evident.

The Wayne County Medical Examiner's Office reported that cocaine and its derivatives is now found in over 38% of all cases processed. Similarly, the local press has continually cited the increased numbers of drug related homicides, especially among our teenage citizens and I do not consider it coincidental that the number of homicides increased steadily, from 618 to 815 per year in Wayne County from 1984 to 1987, while the population of the County is decreasing. I am drawn to the conclusion that in Wayne County those who use cocaine are more likely, than those who do not, to become Medical Examiner's cases!

Another statistic that illustrates the rising cost of substance abuse control in Detroit, reported from the National Institute of Justice (March/April, 1988; No. 208), is that 66% of those persons incarcerated for criminal activities tested positive for drug usage at least 24 hours prior to their arrest.

The rapidly increasing proportion of AIDS cases in Detroit are due to IV drug abuse. Although heroin has been replaced by cocaine as the primary drug of choice, there are scores of persons who were treated in the 70's that now are suffering from

AIDS. We now know the infection can lay dormant for years. Blacks are particularly affected, now, by this development because of the availability of the heroin, during those times, and becoming the predominant users and subsequent victims of IV drug use.

I can go on and on about the problems affecting Detroit, and I can presume, every other major urban area; however, I think that the need for increased federal revenues in this area is evident. The money will not take the place of changing community values and attitudes, better law enforcement, or the alleviation of the conditions that perpetuate the environments that foster and abet substance abuse; but will enable Detroit and other cities facing this dilemma to wage the necessary war against those who would destroy our communities. Increased federal spending in this area will enable this community, and others, to assist those who seek and want the type of treatment that the best medically equipped country in the world can provide; and to educate our youth.

Detroit and its citizens are not sitting idly by as this war wages on. Two new judgeships have been created to address the increased demand on the judicial system. The Police Department has stepped up its arrests and prosecution of those selling and using illegal drugs. Legislation have been adopted by city government to address issues such as AIDS, parental control of youth, drug paraphernalia sales, etc. The community has mobilized to form neighborhood watch programs, hold intervention and prevention programs, and assist the Detroit school system in the implementation of various State mandated awareness and intervention programs for youth. As President of the Detroit City Council, I have witnessed an increased request for Detroit Block Grant Funds from community based organizations to begin to tackle the problems of and created by substance abuse in neighborhoods. Millages have been passed by the voters in support of upgrading the corrections systems. However, this is not enough!! A strong federal policy, with a commitment to uphold and deliver, is necessary in support of these efforts.

The federal budget cuts of the current administration have assisted the growth of abuse problems faced by municipalities. The influx of drugs into the United States, bound for Michigan, and sold in Detroit must be stopped through Federal interdiction and enforcement. Our youth are dying!

If an effective Anti-Drug bill is to be implemented, it must provide the necessary mechanisms and revenues to enable municipalities to educate, treat, and if necessary; to prosecute to the fullest extent of the law. I must reiterate, and cannot emphasize strongly enough, that the administration must review the manner in which it wages the "war on drugs" with a view toward achieving stronger leadership over the agencies involved in the effort and effective implementation of a federal drug strategy. It is absolutely necessary to have the assistance of all branches of government and the necessary arms that are needed to fight this or any other war in order to protect the life, liberty, and quality of living of the citizenry.

CLOSING THE DOOR ON CRIMINAL ELEMENTS IN THE PCB DISPOSAL BUSINESS

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, I will join with subcommittee Chairman MIKE SYNAR in testifying before the Senate Environment Committee in support of legislation to close various loopholes in the regulation of PCB's. The bill which we introduced along with Representatives ILE SKELTON and ALAN WHEAT last year, and which was approved by the House last month, addresses the failure of existing legislation to regulate the activities of PCB brokers.

With quick Senate action, we can close the door on what at least one law enforcement official has termed a perfect point of infiltration into the PCB business for criminal elements and organized crime.

Earlier today, I participated in an investigative hearing convened by the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy and Natural Resources, on which I serve as the ranking minority member. The hearing was particularly timely, with testimony presented which revealed that criminal elements have in fact infiltrated the hazardous waste and PCB disposal business. Intelligence files have been discovered that are filled with information alleging the involvement in narcotics, prostitution, pornography and illegal gambling of certain individuals who have been directly associated with companies handling toxic PCB material.

Federal, State and local enforcement agencies have compiled information linking various hazardous waste and PCB firms with a cast of characters whom none of us would like to meet in a dark alley.

With many of the firms associated with these individuals racking up numerous regulatory compliance violations, it is important to review how EPA is addressing the growing problem of criminal involvement in the waste business.

Based on testimony received today, it is apparent that EPA has become increasingly aware of the problem and has taken steps to tighten permitting standards and strengthen compliance enforcement.

However, I remain concerned that the lines of communication between EPA's National Enforcement Investigations Center and EPA program officials are seriously inadequate. There have been instances when NEIC had information indicating that individuals directly involved in the handling of PCB's were believed to be tied to criminal activities, yet the enforcement center failed to inform those EPA officials responsible for overseeing PCB permits. Steps must be taken to ensure that program officials have the information necessary to an effective and efficient compliance program.

The environmental stakes are too high and the public health risks too great to allow unsavory criminal elements to become responsible for this Nation's disposal of hazardous waste. Today's hearing not only established the fact that criminal elements have made inroads into

the PCB business, but also served to highlight the many challenges facing the PCB regulatory program. Tomorrow, we have an opportunity to take another step forward in successfully meeting those challenges. Thank you.

SETTING INCREASED UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL EXPORT TRADE TARGETS FOR SOUTH KOREA, JAPAN, AND THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which expresses the sense of Congress that South Korea, Japan, and the European Economic Community have a responsibility to reduce their trade surpluses with the United States and that the administration should set a minimum \$4 billion agricultural export trade target when negotiating these reductions.

Our trading partners have been able to build much of their economic prosperity in recent years on our relatively open market and our appetite for imports. Last year our trade deficit with South Korea reached \$10 billion, with Japan \$60 billion, and with the EC \$24 billion.

What these nations appear to have forgotten in this \$94 billion trade surplus relationship is that they have a responsibility to try to reduce these large surpluses. They have an obligation to import more of our products and to provide us a fair market share. The resolution I am introducing today is meant to remind our trading partners of this basic responsibility.

In negotiating for trade surplus reductions with South Korea, Japan, and the EC, the administration should set specific export targets. I suggest a minimum \$4 billion agricultural target made up of increased beef and wheat exports. The minimum target should be \$1.4 billion for Japan, \$0.6 billion for South Korea, and \$2 billion for the EC.

EXPORT TARGETS TO JAPAN

The United States has been a recipient of billions of dollars in Japanese goods—from autos to electronics. Indeed the Japanese have been very successful at resurrecting their economy over the years based on exports. But, Japan appears to be unconcerned about its responsibilities as a world economic leader. Its current economic structure is placing a strain on the world economy and especially that of the United States. The current trade deficit with Japan threatens the harmony of this vital relationship.

In negotiating with the Japanese to reduce the \$60 billion trade imbalance, specific export goals should be offered to offset our trade deficit with them. In the agricultural sector there are many opportunities for enhancing our exports to Japan.

The United States should set an agricultural trade export target to Japan of approximately \$1.4 billion which would come from increased beef and wheat exports. This figure represents a \$1 billion increase in beef and \$400 million increase in wheat exports. Accepting

these targets would be a sign of good faith on the part of the Japanese.

EXPORT TARGETS TO SOUTH KOREA

South Korea has performed something close to a trade miracle in recent years. In the last 5 years the United States has increased its imports from Korea by 127 percent, and in return, the United States has found no reciprocity to stop a snowballing surplus which stood at \$10 billion last year.

What is it we are asking of the South Koreans? Simply put, it's fairness. If the United States is to continue providing open markets for South Korean Hyundais and other imports, then the Koreans have an obligation to allow us to gain a share of their market.

The United States should set a beef export target of about \$0.4 billion. Currently, the South Koreans have a ban on beef imports, but there is growing demand for beef in Korea, and the United States should be given the opportunity to fill that demand. Moreover, the United States should anticipate exporting about \$2 billion of wheat over last year's levels. Thus, the United States should begin negotiating for a total of \$0.6 billion more in agricultural exports for these items.

EXPORT TRADE TARGETS TO THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The EC, too, is running a trade surplus with the United States and competing with us for agricultural markets all over the world. This does not excuse the EC from its obligation as a trading partner. We have the same expectations, that is, import more in order to address the EC's 1987 trade surplus of \$24 billion.

One agricultural target that could easily be met is in our beef exports. In 1986-87 the United States exported a mere 6,400 metric tons of beef and veal to the EC. The United States should expect to gain a portion of the market that now exists in the EC. The United States should expect to export about \$2 billion of beef.

SETTING THE 4 BILLION DOLLAR EXPORT TARGET

The United States cannot export its way out of its trade deficit. To do so would require us to double our total market share in the world. That's impossible. But, the United States can expect to increase its exports to nations with substantial trade surpluses.

I urge the administration to sit down with our trading partners and set a minimum United States agricultural export target of \$4 billion. This represents a mere 4% offset in our \$90-plus billion trade deficit with South Korea, Japan, and the EC.

I request that my colleagues cosponsor this concurrent resolution.

Text follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that South Korea, Japan, and the European Economic Community have a responsibility to reduce their trade surpluses with the United States, and that the President should set a minimum target for increases in agricultural exports of the United States when negotiating trade surplus reductions

Whereas the economic system of the United States is the largest and most open market in the world;

Whereas the total merchandise trade surplus of South Korea, Japan, and the Euro-

pean Economic Community with the United States was approximately \$90,000,000,000 last year; and

Whereas South Korea, Japan, and the European Economic Community have a responsibility as trading partners of the United States to reduce the trade surpluses; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) South Korea, Japan, and the European Economic Community have a responsibility to reduce their trade surpluses with the United States;

(2) The President should enter into bilateral trade negotiations with South Korea, Japan, and the European Economic Community to reduce their trade surpluses with the United States;

(3) the President should set a minimum target for increases in agricultural exports of the United States of \$4,000,000,000 when negotiating trade surplus reductions; and

(4) in reaching the minimum target for increases in agricultural exports, the United States should increase beef and wheat exports to South Korea by \$600,000,000, beef and wheat exports to Japan by \$1,400,000,000, and beef exports to the European Economic Community by \$2,000,000,000.

UNITED STATES DOWNPLAYS CARIBBEAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, the threat of water pollution knows no boundaries. The people of the U.S. Virgin Islands, who share magnificent clean waters with their Caribbean neighbors, understand that well. I wish the U.S. Department of State shared that understanding.

In the U.S. Virgin Islands, we have been alarmed by recent reports that a company from Philadelphia was considering a plan to ship stateside garbage for disposal off of the nearby island of Saba in the Netherlands Antilles. Thanks to a strong public reaction in Saba and other islands, we managed to shoot down that plan. But we still have to ask what are we doing, what is the United States doing, to prevent anyone else from considering a similar scheme that would mean big money for a few pockets and fouled beaches for the rest of us.

In recent months, this Congress has been actively examining a host of problems related to water pollution. We are discovering that our regulations and our international agreements are not strong enough to control these threats. It is evident that we have to intensify our efforts to work internationally to control a problem that crosses national boundaries.

Unfortunately, when it comes to the Caribbean, our own State Department is reluctant to join in the international effort. It offers only trivial support for U.N. programs that are working to protect the environment in our region and that have the support of the island nations in the region. Some of these small islands are making a major financial commit-

ment to support these programs, but the United States will not join in doing so. Instead, our State Department picks and chooses, offering limited support for a few select projects.

I am submitting my most recent letter to the State Department on this subject for the RECORD. I believe our country should be leading the way in protecting the waters that are crucial to our neighbors in the Caribbean and crucial to our own southern coastal States. We cannot protect that environment by offering limited support to a few selective projects. It is time for our country to join the islands of the Caribbean as a full partner, rather than a half-hearted participant, in regional efforts to protect the environment that we all share.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in seeing that the United States works closely with the islands of the Caribbean as we develop new ideas and new programs to protect our oceans.

The letter to the Secretary of State follows.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 26, 1988.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,

Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been alarmed by recent reports of a new threat to the marine environment in the Virgin Islands and the apparent inability of the United States to respond to this threat. I am speaking of the prospect of stateside and foreign companies turning to the Caribbean as a convenient place to dump their garbage.

When I checked into the ominous plan by Waste Central Inc. of Philadelphia to create a new, supposedly clean, island of garbage off of the island of Saba, I was dismayed to learn that neither U.S. laws nor international treaties would directly outlaw such an outrage. Our inability to control this threat stems, in part, from our country's reluctance to participate fully in the regional environmental programs in the Caribbean, which could be used to prevent such an environmental atrocity.

I wrote to you about this general subject on January 6, 1988, and appreciate the response from your Department. Nevertheless, I feel it is necessary to reiterate my conviction that it is long past time for the United States to get directly and actively involved in the Caribbean Action Plan and Cartagena Convention, the environmental programs administered by the United Nations. Fortunately, in this case, Waste Central's plans fell through. But we cannot afford to wait until another mainland company announces plans to create a "garbage coral reef" in the Caribbean to wake up and realize that we do not have the ability to prevent such a disaster.

The threat of pollution in the Caribbean crosses all international and jurisdictional boundaries. It can only be controlled through much closer international cooperation than now exists. The United States—by virtue of its size and technical expertise—is in the position to lead that cooperation, instead of resisting it or only participating half-heartedly. The United States—by virtue of its interest in protecting the fisheries and coastline of its southern states—should have the motivation to lead in this effort. Finally, the United States—by virtue of its role as the largest producer of garbage and industrial pollutants in the hemisphere—should feel obligated to lead in this international effort. The Caribbean islands are not endangering our internal waters

with their pollutants but, when you get right down to it, we are endangering their waters with ours.

I realize, as Assistant Secretary Fox said in his earlier letter to me, that the United States is taking steps to increase its participation in the Caribbean Action Plan, such as sending a NOAA scientist to the Regional Coordinating Unit in Jamaica and making plans for a conference on specially protected areas and wildlife. While I applaud such efforts, I must say they appear highly selective and inadequate. We are only giving token support to these programs that will help protect the shores of the United States and its territories, as well as those of our Caribbean. I don't see how selective projects and selective bilateral agreements will give us the international cooperation we need to prevent the sort of ecological disasters that Waste Management Inc. had in mind.

Again, I want to urge the State Department to lead the United States toward closer involvement in, and leadership of, the United Nations regional environmental programs in the Caribbean. The United States should be a full partner, instead of a half-hearted participant, in these regional efforts to protect the environment that we all share.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

RON DE LUGO,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN PROJECT FOR PLANES TO WIPE OUT DRUG CROPS IS FALTERING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics, I have for some time been concerned about the effectiveness of the Bureau of International Narcotics Matters Crop Eradication Program in Mexico. The Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, August 3, contains a front page story describing some of the problems effecting the program, including inadequate pay for Mexican pilots compared to their American counterparts, inadequate supplies of spare parts, delays in obtaining spare parts, and restrictions on the ability of American pilots to overfly areas where opium poppy and cannabis are grown to verify the results of the spraying.

While I realize that crop eradication is not an easy task, the article makes clear that there are still obstacles preventing the program from being successful. I have previously indicated to the Department of State that we, in the Congress, stand ready to assist in any reasonable way to make crop eradication programs successful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "U.S.-Mexican Project For Planes to Wipe Out Drug Crops is Faltering" be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 3, 1988]

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN PROJECT FOR PLANES TO WIPE OUT DRUG CROPS IS FALTERING: ILLICIT NARCOTICS KEEP FLOWING AS PROBLEMS WITH PILOTS, AIRCRAFT AND PARTS PILE UP: MANY ACRES OF DEAD POPPIES

(By Stanley Penn)

CULIACAN, MEXICO.—The five Bell 206 helicopters begin threading their way through narrow 7,500-foot mountain passes. Suddenly, a tell-tale hint of scarlet in the underbrush ahead betrays a target.

One chopper eases in at tree-top level. Pilots have learned to be wary: They sometimes find wire mesh waiting to snare them. And occasionally gunfire. Today there is neither. An empty tin-roofed hut and some hastily abandoned tools, blankets and a ratty cowhide below indicate no one stuck around. The pilot opens fire—with a herbicide spray—and the airborne armada then whirls back to base.

The kill: a garden-sized plot of flowering poppies.

This is the Sierra Madre, still hiding a treasure that corrupts. Only these days the treasure is the opium-bearing poppy, the raw material of Mexico's burgeoning heroin trade. For peasants tending tiny, secret mountain plots, the showy red flowers are a cash crop. But as far as U.S. policy makers are concerned, they are a primary target in the war against illicit drugs.

PRE-EMPTIVE STRIKES

Federal strategists some time ago decided that destroying so-called narcotics crops—poppies and marijuana—while they are still in the ground would be more efficient than chasing smugglers. Today, the U.S. backs joint crop-eradication ventures with governments of a dozen drug-supplying countries. This is the biggest.

It is also one of the most troubled. The program is hobbled by mismanagement, red tape, and the whiff of corruption. Fingerprinting between U.S. and Mexican officials over blame strains relations between the countries. Meanwhile, poppy and marijuana growers continue to produce bumper crops. And Mexico continues to be America's chief heroin and marijuana supplier, raising questions about just how workable such foreign eradication programs really are.

At bottom is the question of who is in charge. Most of Mexico's 92 drug-fighting aircraft were purchased with U.S. money. And last year alone, the U.S. spent \$14.5 million here for maintenance, parts and pilot training. But Mexico runs the program, on the ground and in the air.

A TENSE ALLIANCE

"The whole thing has turned into a shambles," asserts Rep. Lawrence J. Smith, head of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's anti-drug task force. "Cajoling, pleading, begging, diplomatic inquiries—none of them work."

The Reagan administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress both are reluctant to push a key ally like Mexico too hard. The Senate last April voted to sanction Mexico for failing to do enough, but the measure died in the House after Mexico promised to try harder to destroy opium-yielding poppy fields.

Top Mexican officials bristle at that kind of U.S. pressure. "The U.S. attitude is, father knows best. We're not little kids who need tutors," says Mexico Deputy Attorney General Jose Maria Ortega-Padilla.

A prickly attitude is somewhat understandable, too. The State Department's

drug-eradication agency in Mexico had had seven different bosses in the past seven years. "How do you establish rapport with Mexicans and gain their respect with so much turnover?" asks one American with close ties to Mexican drug fighters.

A DAUNTING TASK

Under the best conditions, aerial crop destruction is difficult. Expensive modern machines, chemicals and trained pilots are used to find and annihilate obscure plots of plants one at a time. But under conditions existing here, the job is daunting.

U.S. and Mexico officials have squabbled over just about every aspect of the program—right down to the choice of aircraft.

At one point, the U.S. pushed a fixed-wing plane called the Turbo Thrush, used for narcotics-crop eradication elsewhere in Latin America and Asia. The Thrush is fast; a poor target for snipers. It carries 400 gallons of herbicide—six times the payload of a Bell 206 helicopter.

But Mexican authorities complain the Thrush is too fast. "It overshot the poppy fields," and would accidentally spray legitimate crops such as corn, says Deputy Attorney General Ortega. By contrast, they rave about the Bell's maneuverability and even spent nearly \$6 million of Mexico's own funds a while ago for a dozen of them. A fatal Thrush crash early last year settled the issue—four remaining ones and their American pilots were withdrawn from service. The Bell helicopter is now the fleet's workhorse.

The plane issue pales, however, next to other problems. A big headache is poor pay for pilots and mechanics, and the low morale and the turnover that it causes. Mexican government spray pilots currently earn \$809 per month—a better-than-average Mexican wage, but less than what they could make in private industry. American pilots on the State Department's payroll who were flying here until last year say their salaries—including expenses—were \$9,500 a month, or more than 10 times what the Mexican pilots made.

"The Mexicans took the same risks as us, but they got paid this cornbread living," observes one U.S. flier. A State Department offer to supplement the Mexican's pay only irritated Mexican officials. "The pilots cannot have two bosses," declares Deputy Attorney General Ortega.

In the view of one former U.S. adviser, the wage disparity influences the pilots' work habits. Americans took off at daybreak and flew two missions by lunchtime. "The Mexicans," he says, "wouldn't take off till 9. When they got back, that was it for the day." (No one flies in the afternoon, when stiff, hazardous winds rattle through the mountains.)

Mechanics aren't much happier. An investigation of the program's U.S.-funded aircraft maintenance last year showed a mechanics' work slowdown because of poor pay, says Robert Fox, a senior vice president of Evergreen Helicopters Inc., the Portland, Ore., concern hired to do the State Department study. The slowdown was keeping some aircraft grounded unusually long for repairs.

TURNING THE CORNER?

Mexican authorities now claim they are turning the corner with pilots and mechanics. After pilot pay was increased 120% last year to the current \$800-a-month, the pilot roster, which had fallen to 100 last autumn from 159 in 1985, rebounded to 141. Mechanics also got 120% more, and officials are

promoting some to higher-paying jobs as inspectors to keep them.

But the raises have barely kept up with Mexico's inflation rate. And Mr. Fox says that government mechanics, at least, still can readily double their pay by moving to private industry.

In addition to personnel troubles, shortages of repair parts hamper the program. "A plane would sit for weeks because it couldn't get replacement parts," recalls Marvin Foster, until last January a paid aviation adviser to the State Department's narcotics assistance unit here.

At a big Mexico City hangar where spray planes are maintained, the problem is quite evident. Mechanics have stripped one airworthy helicopter down to its skeleton for parts to fix three others.

Shortages occur even though stockpiles are bulging, because many items on hand are obsolete or nonessential. Overall, inventories in 1986 were about twice the \$7 million typical for a fleet this size, according to a recent report by the U.S. General Accounting Office.

Pinpointing the cause is another matter. Rafael Garcia Delgado, Mexico's director of aviation services, blames poor U.S. workmanship. "Parts are sent to the U.S., but aren't repaired properly, so we have to send them back," he says.

Deputy Attorney General Ortega criticizes E-Systems Inc., the Dallas electronics and defense company that, until recently, advised Mexico on maintenance and parts procurement. "In '86 and '87, I never got spare parts in timely fashion, or I didn't get the right amounts," Mr. Ortega says.

E-Systems doesn't argue, but says it isn't to blame. "On a number of occasions during 1986 and 1987, we stopped procurement of parts because funding wasn't available," a company official says. The State Department, in turn, denies any financing problems. Mexico replaced E-Systems with Bell Helicopter Textron Inc., a Textron Inc. subsidiary, when E-Systems' contract expired May 31.

Parts can even be a problem for ground vehicles. One American recalls seeing inoperable fuel trucks at the base at Culiacan and being told various components had been stolen. "They'd tell us there was no battery, or no generator, or no tire, or it needs spark plugs," he says. Mexican authorities won't discuss such allegations.

Hints of corruption dog the spray program, though proven incidents are scarce. "They wouldn't let us work in certain sectors," says one American formerly employed in drug eradication. "Our pilots would fly over these fields. After they got back, they'd check with the zone coordinator, who said he'd have them sprayed by helicopter. He never did." The American suspects those crops were off-limits, though he hasn't any proof.

Mexico concedes some low-level corruption. In the past year, two Mexican pilots were jailed for accepting payments in return for not destroying drug-crop fields. But Deputy Attorney General Ortega denies that crops are regularly protected. "Pilots have the freedom to fumigate whatever fields they might find. They have an obligation to report fields they might find," he says.

In a war where victories are measured by the quarter-acre, assessing progress is slippery business. Last year Mexico claimed that the equivalent of 6,200 acres of poppies were destroyed, up from 5,900 acres the previous year. But more than 15,000 acres of

poppies remained under cultivation, and Mexico's 1987 opium production actually increased over 1986, according to U.S. estimates.

MARIJUANA CROP GROWS

Mexico reported destroying the equivalent of 9,300 acres of marijuana last year, up from 7,350 acres in 1986. Still, the U.S. estimates that the 1987 crop rose to as high as 7,130 tons from 6,000 tons in 1986.

Mexico verifies crop destruction by flying over sprayed sites; it calls on-ground inspections too risky. But the U.S. is pushing for more thorough, on-ground inspections, using helicopters capable of landing in small clearings.

As a step in that direction, Americans here two years ago asked to borrow a Mexican helicopter. The Mexicans said they couldn't spare one. After a year of U.S. badgering, they relented. There was a catch: The proffered helicopter had to be pried off the side of a mountain where it had crashed. It took a year to rebuild.

The incident still irritates Mexican officials. "We have fixed-wing planes for verification, but, no, the Americans want a helicopter," one snaps. "We gave them a helicopter. Soon they'll want ten helicopters. Then 50."

CAMERA CONFUSION

To refine the guesswork on results, the State Department has talked for more than a year of equipping a Mexican plane with a powerful camera. So far, that's only produced more hassles.

First, the Americans dickered among themselves. "The question was, how sophisticated a camera was needed? Should we spend \$50,000, or \$100,000?" recalls a State Department official. Then, an East German model was rejected because "we weren't prepared to buy from them," the official says. Finally, last September, the Americans settled on a camera.

It still hasn't been purchased. Mexico hasn't yet produced a plane to carry it. "When that will be up to the Mexicans," the official says.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. WAYNE DUDLEY

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding leader in the minority community. Dr. Wayne Dudley has served as the chief minority recruiter for the University of Lowell since 1985. Since that time he has more than quadrupled the number of black graduate students at the university. Dr. Dudley has made these great strides in minority enrollment at the graduate level by reaching out to the minority students and acting as the liaison between the university and the student. His excellent and resourceful leadership has made it possible for hundreds of minority students to further their education at the graduate level. I applaud the efforts of Dr. Dudley who has worked so diligently for the improvement of our society by opening up the doors of higher education to minority students, many of whom previously would not have been able to pursue an education at the graduate level.

LOWELL RECRUITER CAMPAIGNS FOR MORE BLACK ENROLLMENT

(By Portia Scott)

When Dr. Wayne Dudley came to the University of Lowell in 1985, there were seven black graduate students. Now there are over 100.

Established just 13 years ago, the school has more than quadrupled its minority undergraduate enrollment.

Dudley's job is to recruit qualified minority students for the university as well as coordinate cultural and social events.

Dudley stresses the importance of supporting the black community in guiding its youth to a brighter future through education.

"If we have poor leadership in our communities, then we'll have poor leadership in our country. I am personally committed to our future, the future of the black community."

Dudley's hours normally extend beyond the regular work day. Some parents, for example, ask him to transport their kids to school, or make temporary loans. High school counselors call him at night to inform him of interested students.

"I am the resource person, I'm the liaison between the people and the university," says Dudley.

And he loves it. He often gives his number out to students interested in attending ULowell, regardless of whether or not they can afford to go.

Black graduate and undergraduate students who attend the school come primarily from the Boston area.

The school has also increased its Cape Verdean, Native American, Asian and Hispanic student enrollment.

After graduating from Morris Brown University in Atlanta, Dudley received a Ph.D. in American History from the University of Cincinnati in 1979. In addition to master's degrees from Atlanta University in 1969 and Harvard University in 1985, he later did post-doctoral work at Harvard.

Dudley was offered positions from prestigious universities across the states, but decided on ULowell because of its youth and potential for growth.

"My contribution to ULowell is to upgrade future education as well as make a solid contribution to the black community," he explained.

ULowell has made some strides in attracting more minority students because of its moderate tuition and high technology curriculum—but black graduate students still find it hard to continue their education.

According to Dudley, "The black enrollment has dropped sharply, 22 percent over the last ten years . . . College graduates can't afford graduate training because they are still paying off debts. Graduates are still looking for work, people have families to take care of."

"Within the last seven years some colleges aren't actively seeking black graduate students—racism has manifested itself on college campuses."

In addition, Dudley attributes the pattern of declining minority enrollment in graduate programs to feelings of isolation experienced by black students on predominantly white campuses. Financial aid is not always readily available, furthering their sense of hopelessness.

Dudley adds, "After graduating, students think everything is hunky-dory—but they find themselves obligated financially."

To close this gap of despair Dudley has proposed a "Mentor Program Assistance

Plan" that would help students regain their hope for continuing their education.

"The program gives minority professionals the opportunity to work full-time at his/her job site and start graduate studies on a part-time basis."

"This plan of action has the clear element which allows the minority professional to work and make a contribution to the community, by bringing more of the student population into higher education."

Killing three birds with one stone, Dudley sees the program making a dent in the attrition rate of aspiring black graduate students.

"The university must continue to make the necessary changes to accommodate to the presence of the students—these new non-traditional students, which includes blacks, Latinos, Southeast Asians, Cape Verdeans—to cope successfully and meet their new academic needs."

"The university is good for everyone, it can prove to have a positive impact in the society—and I'd like to be a part of that."

HONORING THREE WESTERN STARS AND THE WESTERN WALK OF FAME

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, three of America's greatest heroes of western movies and television will be honored on Saturday, August 20, in Santa Clarita, CA.

Doug McClure, Dale Robertson, and the late Edmund "Hoot" Gibson will join 23 other stars of this particularly American art form on the Western Walk of Fame on San Fernando Road. Like Hollywood Boulevard, the 7-year-old Walk of Fame honors the greats of the entertainment industry. What makes the Western Walk of Fame unique is that it pays tribute to only western stars.

And this year's inductees—who join such legends as John Wayne, Gene Autry, and Tom Mix—truly have star credentials.

Doug McClure was born in 1935 in Glendale, CA, and studied drama at Santa Monica City College and UCLA before beginning his successful stage, TV and film career. Fans perhaps remember him best from his many years on NBC's "The Virginian" series, and its followup, "The Men from Shiloh." He also had a minor role in the historic "Roots" TV miniseries. His films include "Shenandoah" with Jimmy Stewart, "The Enemy Below" with Robert Mitchum and "The Unforgiven" with Burt Lancaster. He also is a champion roper, having won the Ben Johnson Pro-Celebrity Team Roping Competition in Oklahoma in 1986.

Dale Robertson, born in Oklahoma in 1923, was a member of the horse cavalry and later an engineering battalion during World War II. He was discharged with honor because of combat injuries after participating in all major invasions of Africa, Italy, and France. He began making films in California almost immediately, commencing a long and fruitful career that has included 63 major motion pictures and more than 430 television episodes. He is

perhaps best known for his long-running series "Tales of Wells Fargo," "The Iron Horse" and "Death Valley Days." Most recently, he has been starring in the TV show "J.J. Starbuck." Robertson also breeds and raises horses on his farm in Yukon, OK.

The late Edmund "Hoot" Gibson (1892-1962) was one of America's most durable and earliest western stars. A native of Nebraska, Gibson was a circus and rodeo performer as well as an actor. From his first western in 1915 "Shotgun Jones," through several silent features directed by the great John Ford to dozens of classic two-reel westerns and B-western features, Gibson kept his slow, bantering style. Gibson's movies were known for their good guy-bad guy storylines and for their dynamic finishes, featuring his famed riding expertise.

Mr. Speaker, we honor these men not just for their work and their contributions to American film art. We also honor them because for decades they have reminded us of the classic pioneer, rough-and-ready spirit that made America great. By telling stories of the old West, they have told us much about ourselves.

THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARIAS PEACE PLAN

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, during this past weekend, while we were all home in our districts busily meeting constituents, holding town hall meetings to air grievances, solving problems, and laying groundwork for the upcoming congressional elections, the Nicaraguan people quietly marked the first anniversary of the Arias peace plan.

Unfortunately, they have not felt the promised benefits of that plan. President Arias of Costa Rica, an idealistic and talented man, received his Nobel Peace Prize. The Sandinistas got much-needed breathing room from the Congress. But the Nicaraguan people have gotten nothing—no town hall meetings, no free expression, no elections, no Congress, no freedom and no democracy.

Several weeks ago the Sandinistas, who proclaim they are still trying to comply with the Arias plan, showed the real substance of their revolution. In 7 days they hit every impetus for democracy in Nicaragua. They attacked the United States by expelling our Ambassador, the Catholic Church by stopping its radio broadcasts, the free press by shutting down La Prensa, free assembly by crushing the peaceful protest in Nandime, and free enterprise by seizing the largest privately held manufacturing firm in the country and the only one still turning a profit. This is merely the latest phase in the long pattern of Sandinista oppression which has consistently occurred despite what Comandante Ortega signed. The Sandinistas have not improved in 9 years and the Arias peace plan has changed nothing.

Unfortunately, this Congress has cut off the only force for democracy the Sandinistas cannot shut down: the Contras. Ambassador

Melton meeting with members of my staff after his unceremonious expulsion said: "To a man, everyone I met with among the Nicaraguan political opposition, whether Conservative, Christian Democrat, Social Democrats, moderate independents, or trade unionists, whether he supported a military solution or not, believes any freedom they have, any breathing room they get, is a result of the pressure brought by the Contras."

Over and over again, the Communists break their word and we give them another chance. No Member of Congress would tolerate that kind of treatment in this country. I will continue to support the Contras until the Sandinistas comply with the terms of the many international agreements they have signed, keep the years of promises they have made and bring democracy and free elections to the Nicaraguan people.

CARIBBEAN SCHOLARSHIPS PROGRAM DESCRIBED

HON. JAIME B. FUSTER

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out to my colleagues a bill sponsored by me and by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] that would accomplish something unique in the area of foreign affairs. Our bill, H.R. 3806, would establish the Caribbean Basin Scholarship Program—and would do it in a way that would be cost-effective for the United States, for Puerto Rico, and for the Caribbean, which region, as we know, is of considerable strategic importance to the Nation.

With that in mind, I would like to share with my colleagues extracts from my statement which I delivered on August 10 at hearings before the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member.

As I said at the hearings, H.R. 3806 would authorize the creation of up to 1,000 scholarships for students from Caribbean Basin countries to help them obtain associate degrees or undergraduate degrees in institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

These hearings, we hope, will be the beginning of a more extended examination of the role that educational institutions in Puerto Rico can and should play in the overall development of the Caribbean region.

As my colleagues already know, because of our location and because of our Hispanic and non-Hispanic heritage, Puerto Rico shares many fundamental characteristics with most of the other countries in the region. In particular, we share a strong bond of solidarity with the Caribbean nations' aspirations for progress in economic, social and political terms. Strong linkages indeed have been forged by many years of varied and intense inter-relationships stemming out of our common circumstances, our similar past and our shared vision of the future.

Those interrelationships date back several centuries. However, they have been particular-

ly strong in the last four decades, when Operation Bootstrap began in Puerto Rico, transforming our island community from the poorest society in the region to the one that currently has the highest income per capita and the highest standards of living in Latin America. Forging new economic development strategies and new forms of association between countries, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has also been playing a significant role in U.S.-Caribbean relations while serving as a catalyst for economic and political development in the region.

An important role played by Puerto Rico has been precisely in the area of regional education and training. Since 1950, more than 40,000 men and women from nations and territories throughout the world, but mostly from the region, have been trained in Puerto Rico in a wide variety of areas, which run the gamut from agriculture, industrial and economic development to public administration and health sciences.

An example of the pioneering role the Commonwealth has played was an agreement entered with the U.S. International Cooperation Administration in the 1960's to make use of Puerto Rico's resources as a center for training and as a source of special technical competence and experience. As a result of that agreement, engineered by then Governor Luis Muñoz Marín and ICA Director Rollin S. Atwood, 7,000 international students participated in educational and training programs in Puerto Rico between 1960 and 1970 alone.

Another example is to be found in the unique institutions founded by Jaime Benítez, then President of the University of Puerto Rico, later a Member of Congress. I refer to the Union of Caribbean Universities known as UNICA, and to the Center for Caribbean Studies at the University of Puerto Rico, both of which helped to provide nongovernmental linkages to strengthen the Caribbean institutions participating in them. Those were also enterprising and pathfinding years for Inter-American University, a private institution in Puerto Rico, where thousands of West Indian students came to study and then went back to their own countries well equipped to promote their own economic development. One graduate of these efforts is well known to some members of this subcommittee. I refer to the Honorable Ambassador of St. Lucia to the United States, Mr. Joseph Edmunds, who studied in Puerto Rico. The success of these efforts is also reflected in the positive commentaries about Puerto Rico's universities made by Mr. Atherton Martin when he testified before this committee last week.

Both the private and public institutions in Puerto Rico have continued strengthening their ties with Caribbean institutions. The Center for Caribbean Studies continues to conduct important work in this regard, as well as the new Center for Advanced Studies of Puerto Rico and the Caribbean, established by the well-known Puerto Rican historian Arturo Morales Carrión, a former U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs in the Kennedy administration and who was also a high ranking official of the Organization of the American States. Currently, the University of Puerto Rico and Inter-American

University are linked in exchange programs with the Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra in the Dominican Republic.

The Medical Sciences Campus of the University of Puerto Rico continues to play a key role in the improvement of health conditions in the Caribbean, training medical technicians and doctors from practically all the countries of the region.

Puerto Rico's contribution to the development of the region, of course, has not been limited to educational functions. During the 1960's Puerto Rico played a leading role in the development of the Alliance for Progress. The architect of Puerto Rico's industrialization program, Teodoro Moscoso, was appointed to head the Alliance for Progress by President Kennedy and he later was named U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela. Now, a full two decades after the Alliance for Progress, when the United States has established the Caribbean Basin Initiative Program, Puerto Rico once again has geared itself to help in any way it can to make this new plan for inter-American collaboration and development a success.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has been working hard to assist the United States to achieve the CBI's main objective of assuring political stability through economic prosperity in the region. Specifically we have helped the attainment of this goal by establishing a plan for direct economic development, known as the "Twin Plants Program," which calls for part of a manufacturing process to be done in one of the countries of the region while the finishing process is undertaken in Puerto Rico. Fifty-one new plants have been established in the region generating close to 9,000 new jobs for our neighbors just in the last couple of years.

In another aspect of Puerto Rico's contribution to the CBI just last week the Governor of Puerto Rico announced the names of the first 10 university students from the region to benefit from the newly created Caribbean Scholarship Program, sponsored by Puerto Rico's Economic Development Administration and with donations from companies and factories in the island that benefit from section 936 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Speaker, we in Puerto Rico have already begun to do our share in the task of helping promote the development of the region. However, in order to assure the further success of the economic development of the Caribbean it is necessary to strengthen the regional workforce through education and training programs. There is still a substantial unmet need for scholarships in the potential beneficiary countries.

Moreover, the need for these types of programs has become even more urgent in light of the increased Soviet and Cuban influence in the educational area. This problem has been recognized since 1984 when the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America—known as the Kissinger Commission—included as one of its major recommendations the increase of educational and training programs in the region as a major tool to promote economic prosperity and political stability. The Commission concluded specifically that the greatest need is the training of university students, especially in light of increased

Soviet influence reflected in the numbers of scholarships awarded in the region.

Although some new programs have been authorized as a result of the Commission's recommendations, much still remains to be done in this area. The latest figures show that in 1988 the Soviet bloc sponsored over 10,000 university scholarships for Central American students from primarily disadvantaged background. In contrast, only 3,600 scholarships were sponsored by the United States this year.

In view of these needs and because the Commonwealth believes in the importance of the helping to foster the institutional capabilities and human capital of its neighboring countries, Puerto Rico is committed to expand its role in the education and training of the regional workforce in partnership with the Federal Government.

Specifically, the Caribbean Basin Scholarships Program as envisioned in H.R. 3806 would identify skill shortages in the region and provide up to 1,000 educational and vocational training scholarships primarily for economically disadvantaged students. The program authorizes scholarships for study in Puerto Rican institutions because we are in an ideal position to provide training that is very adequate to the needs of the Caribbean and Central American students. First, we have an educational system and technical expertise that is on comparable quality to that offered by common educational institutions in the mainland United States. Second, we can offer training and higher cost for tuition, room and board for a student in a private or public university in Puerto Rico was \$6,000 per year in contrast to twice or three times that amount in a mainland institution.

Third, as an integral part of the Caribbean, Puerto Rico offers a unique opportunity for students in the region to pursue their education in a climate and cultural atmosphere similar to that of their country of origin while having the opportunity to develop their bilingual skills, in a jurisdiction which is part of the U.S. system. Moreover, by centering this program in the region, H.R. 3806 addresses the concerns of many regional leaders about the brain problem created by U.S. scholarship programs.

Fourth, our strong political structure, firmly rooted in our respect for democratic values provides a living demonstration of how a Caribbean community with limited resources to meet its development needs has achieved political stability and adopted the free enterprise system.

Finally, Puerto Rico is an ongoing laboratory of economic development strategies. We are experts in that field. We have tried many policies. We know which ones work, when and where. We also know which ones have failed, why and how. This is an experience that can scarcely be found so systematically conceptualized in any other place in the continent.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the authorization of the Caribbean Basin Scholarship Program would be mutually beneficial to the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Caribbean Region. For the United States it offers the opportunity to fulfill its leadership role in the region in a fiscally responsible manner. For Puerto Rico, this program would help develop

closer ties with its Caribbean neighbors through its excellent educational institutions.

For the countries and students in the Caribbean it represents a unique opportunity to provide relevant educational skills and nurture the work force and economic capability of regional institutions, while retaining talent in the region. For these reasons and the ones advanced by Mr. Guarini, I commend to you the Caribbean Basin Scholarship Act.

A TRIBUTE TO BILL KOLENDER

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to call to my colleagues' attention a fellow San Diegoan and commend him for 32 years of public service to the citizens of our city and Nation.

Bill Kolender, who rose from a 21-year-old patrolman to become the youngest chief of police in San Diego Police Department history, has resigned his position to become an executive for the Union-Tribune Publishing Co.

Kolender served as chief of police for 13 years, the longest tenure of any currently serving chief in a major city.

Kolender is a native of Chicago. He joined the San Diego Police Department in 1956 as a patrolman in southeast San Diego, Old Town and other areas of the city before becoming the department's first community relations officer.

And throughout his police career Kolender was a highly motivated, very active man in community affairs. He was president of the California College Board of Governors and a member of the board of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The list of awards he has been given is a page and a half long and he has been involved with many, many charitable organizations and has been a leader in the Boy Scouts of America and the San Diego Boys Clubs.

He was one of the founders of the police department's community oriented policing program, which stressed a service role for officers; and his ability to keep in close touch with the public set an example for all the officers under his command.

Being chief of police of the seventh largest city in the Nation was not without its trials and tribulations. Kolender said:

As long as you have tremendous growth, socioeconomic conditions such as we have, the increased use of drugs, the proliferation of handguns, and the inability of the courts to cope with the criminals accused and convicted of crimes you will have violence. You're going to have conflicts and problems.

But even Kolender's critics speak well of his achievements.

Vernon Sukumu, executive director of the Black Federation said:

Certainly we have had some disagreements about certain issues. At the same time he was the first police chief to be accessible to all of the community, the black community, the brown community. He's

overseen the hiring of women and minorities.

Like Sukumu, most San Diegans acclaimed Kolender for improving communication and exchange between all elements of San Diego and the police department.

"God bless him, he's a good chief," said Bill Cowling II, president of the San Diego Crime Commission.

I would like for those words to echo here in this House and express our deep gratitude for his distinguished career of public service and wish him well in the future.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS NO DETERRENT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am bewildered by those who, espousing an abhorrence to drugs and drug pushers insist that a death penalty amendment be included in the Omnibus Drug Initiative. This controversial provision will do nothing to help enable law enforcement authorities abolish the illegal narcotics trade.

At the very least, those who argue that capital punishment deters capital crime should produce facts to substantiate this outrageous claim. Decisionmaking based on speculation instead of the facts in evidence, is hardly prudent.

What is necessary to establish that the death penalty is a deterrent? First and foremost, it is necessary to demonstrate that those States which impose capital punishment have a significantly lower rate of murder than those States which have abolished it. However, the facts show that this simply is not the case. Second, there should be evidence of an appreciable murder decrease in those communities where a highly publicized execution occurs in connection with a notorious crime. Proponents of capital punishment cannot point to one such occurrence. Third, States which have imposed the death penalty ought to experience a sharp decline in crimes which carry this penalty, while those which have abolished it ought to show a sharp increase in the same crimes. This is not the case in a single instance where States have imposed or abolished the death penalty. Fourth, the residents of States which authorize the death penalty should feel safer on their streets than do the citizens of those States which have repealed the death penalty. But again, this simply is not the case. Florida, Texas and California have 25 percent of the total number of persons awaiting execution in the United States. Their residents do not feel any safer than those in Michigan, Massachusetts, and South Dakota. Placing the mass murderers of California, the drug-dealer murderers of Florida and the cowboy killers of Texas on death row has not made Los Angeles' Sunset Boulevard or Miami's Flager Street or Houston's Main Street any safer than King Street in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Clearly, if the death penalty were any kind of effective deterrent, those States which apply it would have fewer incidents of major crime. At a minimum there ought to be an es-

tablished relationship between the threat of capital punishment and the fear of criminals to practice those crimes which carry a capital punishment. There is no known correlation.

In contrast to this and many other studies, those who claim the deterrence effect of capital punishment have failed to advance this argument beyond conjecture. They have not substantiated the requirements necessary to establish that capital punishment deters criminal activity. First, they should demonstrate that criminals pause, think and make judgments about the consequences of being caught before they commit capital crimes. Second, within this decisionmaking process, do individuals weigh the possibility of death or some lesser sentence before committing criminal acts? Third, if the aforementioned process occurs, how often does the threat of capital punishment prevent an act of murder? To the contrary, the evidence indicates that most murderers give little, if any, thought to being apprehended, and no thought to being executed. These individuals usually find themselves in a state of total disbelief when confronted with the reality of a prosecution demanding the death penalty.

In addition to the empirical evidence produced in this country, European studies also show the failure of capital punishment as a deterrent. Mr. Robert Badinter, Minister of Justice of the French Republic, in a 1983 speech before Amnesty International, USA, cited such evidence. He said:

Specifically, from 1888 to 1897, the various Presidents of France made only sparing use of their powers of commutation and the guillotine was in steady operation. The number of murders during that 10 year period was 3,066. On the otherhand, from 1898 to 1907, the Presidents of France, who happened to be abolitionists, systematically commuted all death sentences. If the proponents of the death penalty as a means of deterrence are to be believed, this period of announced clemency should have brought about a striking increase in violent crime. What in fact happened? Exactly the opposite, while the guillotine was idle, the number of murders fell by 50-percent.

Here is further concrete evidence. In Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Washington, the average murder rate for the years when the death penalty was in effect are higher than when it was not in effect. Capital crimes in States such as Alaska, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, and Minnesota, which have no capital punishment, are no higher than States which impose it. In fact, the five States which lead in the number of murders per 100,000 population (Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, and Texas) all use the death penalty. On the otherhand, the five States with the lowest murder rates per 100,000 population (Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, New Hampshire and North Dakota) have abolished the death penalty. Factors other than the death penalty are important in affecting the changes in murder rates in these States.

Mr. Speaker, if we have any genuine intention of enacting responsible legislation to help law enforcement officials fight drug related criminal activity we will reject all irrelevant amendments to the Omnibus Drug Initiative and enact an effective law. A capital punishment amendment may be emotionally appeal-

ing to some but it is irrelevant to our cause. We cannot pretend that this amendment will protect the innocent citizens of our Nation from the drug related crimes running rampant in our streets. The empirical evidence is all to the contrary. A capital punishment law will not stop a single mugging, a single burglary or a single murder and we must not fool ourselves into thinking that it might help stop illegal drug use.

SMALL BUSINESS AND HEALTH CARE

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an important study recently completed for the National Association For the Self-Employed [NASE] on the availability and cost of health insurance in small-business concerns. This study sheds new light on a subject that has been the focus of a great deal of attention in the Congress this year—one that holds great significance for my constituents and for those of my colleagues.

Highlights of this study reveal that:

First, the cost of mandated health benefits could add between \$1,000 and \$1,500 a year for each full-time employee to the operating costs of small employers. This cost is two to three times greater than the \$529 that the average uninsured firm currently contributes in FICA—Social Security—taxes for each employee;

Second, the cost of insuring all employees, regardless of other coverage, could reduce a small firm's profits or owner's salary by between 19 and 30 percent or could increase a firm's losses by those amounts;

Third, the average profit or owner's salary for firms not offering insurance was \$32,000. Eight percent earned a profit or owner's salary of less than \$10,000, and another 8 percent had suffered a loss in the previous year;

Fourth, interestingly enough, 18 percent of those firms that 2 years ago did not offer employees health benefits now provide those benefits;

Fifth, average revenues for firms offering insurance is \$845,000, compared to \$232,000 for firms not offering insurance; and finally,

Sixth, employees in more than one-third of the firms surveyed are already covered by other sources.

The NASE study proves what many of us who oppose mandated health benefits have long felt—that the cost of such mandates could be fatal to many small firms and could severely curtail the productivity of many others. This study provides a strong argument against federally mandated health benefits, and I recommend the study to each of my colleagues. This data should receive our very serious consideration as we continue the debate over mandated health benefits.

The study, entitled "Increases in Health Insurance Coverage Among Small Firms 1986-1988," was commissioned by NASE. Organized 7 years ago, NASE is the fastest grow-

ing small business association in the Nation, with more than 100,000 members. Its rapid growth reflects the excellence of its leadership, and the association has become a most effective advocate for its members and for small-business interests in general. NASE's Washington advocate is long-time small-business activist Jere Glover.

The study was conducted by the highly respected research firm, Lewin/ICF, a division of Health and Sciences Research, Inc., of Washington, DC. This firm also conducted the initial health insurance survey of small businesses for the U.S. Small Business Administration in 1986. That study found that 65 percent of workers employed by businesses not offering insurance worked in firms with fewer than 10 employees. Mandated health insurance legislation was introduced in Congress soon after the release of that 1986 study.

In order to ensure the reliability of the data in its new study, NASE chose the same research firm and directed that the same firms surveyed in 1986 be surveyed again. The new study is an important document, in that it provides for the first time factually supported data on the adverse economic impact that such legislation could have on small businesses. Small businesses are the primary source of job creation in this country and serve as the primary stabilizing force in our economy. What hurts small business hampers our economic growth.

I continue to oppose legislation that would require all employers to provide health insurance for full-time employees and their families regardless of other coverage they may hold. One reason for my opposition has been the lack of sufficient factual data on the costs such legislation might actually impose on businesses, and the effect that those costs might have on small businesses in particular.

Proponents of mandated health coverage estimate the cost of such mandates to be \$80 a month for each full-time employee—a figure many of us believe to be extremely conservative. In order to provide a range of potential costs to employers, the NASE study used both the \$80 figure and an alternative figure of \$125 a month for each employee. The study proves that, whether the cost is \$80 or \$125 for each employee, the effects could be fatal to many small firms and could severely curtail the productivity of many others. All of these firms are important to our economy.

Furthermore, this study reveals that employees in more than one-third—34 percent—of the firms surveyed were covered elsewhere, which leads to the conclusion that the need for federally mandated health benefits may be vastly overstated.

The information contained in the NASE study sheds new light on the debate over mandated health benefits and provides a strong argument against the imposition of federally mandated health benefits. I want to publicly commend the National Association For the Self-Employed for its resourcefulness in commissioning the study and Lewin/ICF for its professionalism in conducting it. Their work has provided important new data that had been lacking from our debates on this vital issue.

It is my understanding that a copy of the study is being made available to every

Member of Congress. I commend it to your reading and suggest that the data contained in the study be given our very serious consideration as we pursue the discussion of the feasibility of mandated health benefits.

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the American Political Science Association on the 35th anniversary of its congressional fellowship program. Begun in 1953 with only 6 fellows, the program has grown to the point where nearly 50 fellows were placed in congressional offices during the 2d session of the 100th Congress.

I believe that the caliber of the APSA Program is reflected in the diversity of experience that its participants bring to the Hill. This year's class of fellows included Federal executives, journalists, health professionals, political scientists, anthropologists, and foreign professionals. Competition for acceptance into the program is keen.

I have had a number of fellows serve all or part of their 9-month tour in the program as a fully integrated member of my staff. This has truly been a mutually beneficial experience, as the fellows have brought fresh and welcome insight into a variety of issues. Conversely, I believe the fellows have returned to their parent organizations with a better understanding and appreciation of the realities of congressional life.

I congratulate the American Political Science Association for its achievements in expanding this extremely worthwhile program from its meager beginnings 35 years ago. It is with great pleasure that I look forward to welcoming the next class of fellows.

FLORENCE PARLETT—FLYING ACE

HON. C. THOMAS McMILLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to bring this House's attention to a truly remarkable resident of my district. Last week, 82-year-old Florence Parlett of Edgewater, MD, was recognized by the Federal Aviation Administration for its Aviation Pioneer Award, honoring her lifetime commitment to flying.

Florence has spent 31 years as a flyer and teacher of young pilots, and operator of Lee Airport near Annapolis. When she took to the skies in the 1950's propellers still ruled the day and women in a cockpit was an oddity. Florence has not only contributed to the profession through training young pilots, she's fought for the rights of small airports to stay in business. Recently she was instrumental in reaching a compromise with local officials and

residents to keep our Lee airport open to small aircraft.

In an era where youth is glorified, it's inspiring to have an octogenarian among us to show Americans that life doesn't end at 40 or 60—or even 80. I commend the FAA for recognizing Florence's contribution to aviation, and wish her many more happy years in the air.

MAKE PERMANENT THE GREAT LAKES SET-ASIDE

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a bill I introduced last week that would extend into perpetuity the Great Lakes set-aside for Public Law 480 title II cargo. My bill, H.R. 5162, would ensure permanently that Great Lakes ports receive their fair share of the "Food for Peace" shipments by not allowing the set-aside to expire as it is scheduled to do at the end of 1989.

Originally included in the Food Security Act of 1985, the Great Lakes set-aside was a thoughtful compromise to guarantee the Great Lakes a portion of a huge Federal program. The Food Security Act mandated that 50 percent of the export shipping under this legislation must be carried on U.S.-flag vessels with that percentage increasing to 75 percent in the spring of this year. Because no U.S.-flag lines are based in the Great Lakes, it was deemed necessary to create the guaranteed set-aside. The Great Lakes set-aside was a good idea then and it is an even more necessary step now that the percentage has raised.

The success of the Great Lakes set-aside provision is easily measured throughout the region. Today, the distribution of Public Law 480 cargo in the Great Lakes ports is probably more even than it has been in many years. The ports in that region are undergoing a resurgence of activity that means more jobs at good wages for laborers and increased prosperity for businesses. The Great Lakes set-aside is a shining example of successful legislative compromise.

I think that it is a worthwhile goal to assist U.S. shipyards by requiring that the majority of Public Law 480 cargo be carried on U.S.-flag vessels. There is no doubt that American shipbuilding is an industry that has been allowed to decline far too long. It is also our responsibility to see that as many regions of the country as possible enjoy the benefits of huge Federal programs. Allowing the Great Lakes set-aside to expire would effectively prohibit Great Lakes ports from receiving any Public Law 480 cargo as only foreign-flag vessels call on their ports. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of my bill to make permanent the Great Lakes set-aside because it is, in the broadest sense, legislation in the national interest.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO JOYCE AND HARRY CHRISTENSEN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding couple in my district, Joyce and Harry Christensen. Joyce and Harry will be given the 1988 Humanitarian Award by the Long Beach Lung Association on September 9, 1988, at the Seventh Annual Humanitarian Award presentation. I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words about these two wonderful people.

Joyce Christensen was born in San Pedro, graduated from San Pedro High School, and fortuitously fell into a position on the staff of the San Pedro News-Pilot, a piece of luck that was to influence the rest of her career. Displaying her usual verve and competence, 2 weeks after she started, Joyce was given the job of the society editor of the News-Pilot. When her children were young, Joyce worked part time for the Long Beach Independent in the Women's Section. Eventually, the Independent and the Press-Telegram merged, and Joyce took on the position of assistant editor of the Women's Section. Joyce presided over the section as it changed from "Women's" to "Life", a turning point in the history of the paper. After 10 years as its editor, she became the food editor and the social columnist for the paper.

In her 40-year span as a newspaperwoman, Joyce has found the time to get involved with many civic organizations. She is a member of the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, and the Long Beach Heart Association, and is the past president of both the Women's Council of the Chamber of Commerce and the Soroptimist International of Long Beach. She is a charter member of the Pacific Coast Press Club and a former member of its board, and the founder of International Hostesses. In thanks for her generous contributions of time to the community, Joyce was honored with a Long Beach City Council commendation. She is a pillar of the Long Beach community.

Harry Christensen grew up in nearby Venice, CA, graduated from Huntington Park High School and later, California College of Mortuary Science. In 1946, Harry arrived in Long Beach to establish Christensen-Pino Mortuary. After his business was established, Harry threw himself into community affairs. He joined the Kiwanis and became its president in 1948, and in 1988, he was awarded honorary member status in recognition of his 48 years of service. He is an honorary member of the Long Beach Mounted Police, and rode in several Tournament of Roses parades in the mid-1950's. He was the president of the Long Beach Civic League in the late 1940's and is a life member and former board member of the Long Beach Yacht Club. He is also a charter member of the Pacific Coast Press Club.

Harry's love and obsession, however, is music. Early on in his Kiwanis career, Harry met three other new members and formed a

barbershop quartet. They cut a record, and in their 40-year affiliation have made thousands of public appearances, and given all their proceeds to Kiwanis charities. In addition Harry also directed a 100-voice boys choir in Huntington Park, and is a strong supporter of the Long Beach Symphony. From his love of music stemmed his involvement with the Long Beach Civic Light Opera, an organization that has been Harry's influence in every facet of its operation. He began as a singer in early productions of the Civic Light Opera, and until 2 years ago, was a member of the board of directors. Harry and Joyce founded the Diamond Terrace of the Long Beach Civic Light Opera together, and have seen it become a valued part of the organization.

In choosing to give Joyce and Harry the Humanitarian Award jointly, the Long Beach Lung Association has recognized the fact that in every one of their endeavors, Harry and Joyce have supported one another. The key to their success is their commitment not only to the community but to each other. My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our warmest congratulations to Harry and Joyce on this auspicious occasion. We wish them all the best in the years to come.

BETTER CHILD CARE SERVICES

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Act for Better Child Care Services—the ABC bill. I would first like to commend Representative DALE KILDEE for his strong leadership on this legislation.

No one denies that our current patchwork system of child care facilities and arrangements is grossly inadequate. The debate today is over how to improve it and how to provide working parents, particularly those with low incomes, a range of viable options for securing decent child care for their young children.

My constituents in the 17th District of Illinois believe that investing in quality child care is neither a luxury nor a choice, but a national necessity. They realize that any successful child care policy must address these three issues: availability, affordability, and quality.

The ABC bill is the only proposal that realistically responds to all three. ABC would increase both the supply and the diversity of child care arrangements so that parents will have real choices while helping low- and moderate-income families pay for its cost. ABC would complement the child care systems already in use by States and communities, thus building a workable system from the ground up rather than from Washington down. Most importantly, ABC establishes minimum health and safety protections for all children in child care.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the attached article from the Daily Dispatch in Moline, IL, be printed in the RECORD. It describes the child care problems that face working parents in my district and throughout the entire State.

[From the Moline (IL) Daily Dispatch, Apr. 13, 1988]

DAY CARE FUNDING INCREASE TRIMS WELFARE ROLLS

(By Jackie Chesser)

Sometimes, you have to spend money to make money, says Illinois Sen. Dennis Jacobs, D-East Moline, when he talks about funding day care programs for low-income families.

For him, it's a matter of simple logistics. In order to decrease the public aid rolls, you must provide aid recipients with the means to "better" themselves so they can get jobs and enter the mainstream. "Increased funding for day care is one of the biggest steps to take in welfare reform."

Sen. Jacobs says more and more legislators are backing increased funding for day care because they realize it can help trim the welfare rolls.

"They (welfare recipients) want to go back to work," says state Rep. Joel Brunsvold, D-Milan. If they can't afford to pay for child care they must stay home with the children themselves.

Day care centers also are crucial in providing quality care for children so they make a smoother transition into the education system, he said. If they succeed in school they are less likely to solicit public aid when they get older.

Laurel Walker, executive director of Skip-A-Long Day Care Center in East Moline and Rainbow Skip-A-Long in Rock Island agrees that day care can make or break a child's attitude toward learning. But, like Jacobs and Brunsvold, she's concerned that there isn't enough money available to provide care for all the children who need it.

STAGNANT SPENDING

Sue Howell, of the Department of Children and Family Services, said Illinois receives about \$130 million a year in federal Title XX block grant monies to use for social services.

Ms. Howell said she couldn't say how much federal monies are used for day care funding because the state adds two to three times that amount to the fund. "Illinois is among the few states that spends so much on social service programs," she said.

However, the Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., says federal Title XX monies have been "stagnant" since 1981 which has forced states to add monies. Nationwide, the 1987 federal Title XX budget of \$2.7 billion, if adjusted for inflation, is approximately 75 percent less than the 1981 levels and worth less than half the \$2.5 billion available in 1976, the defense fund states.

In Illinois, total federal-state expenditures for child care actually dropped 0.5 percent from \$55,966,100 in 1981 to \$50,622,900 in 1987, the defense fund states.

Ms. Howell said the state pays for about 18,000 day care slots annually for low-income families. Of those, 15,000 are at "site administered" day care centers like Skip-A-Long. The remaining 2,000 are for regional administered day cares—which don't have to be licensed—authorized in areas where there are no state-funded care centers or for people who need child care services for their children while they work second or third shift.

Also available, she said, is an additional \$182,000 a year for training child care workers. Interested child care workers in Illinois would receive training at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, or at one of North-

ern's satellite sites—in this area, Skip-A-Long.

NEEDS WILL INCREASE

Altogether, 935,000 children under 14 will need day care by 1990 in Illinois, which is about 80,000 more children than were in need in 1986, according to the University of Chicago.

But, only one in seven Illinois children who needs low-income child care gets it now. About 100,000 children under the age of six need the service.

Illinois gives child care dollars to families through the Illinois Department of Public Aid and Department of Children and Family Services.

Public Aid this year has allocated \$23 million for child care for public aid recipients in job training programs and continue to pay it for six months to former recipients now working full-time.

Public Aid will reimburse child care expenses up to \$160 per month per child, says Randy Valenti, public aid administrator for employment and social services.

Without subsidy, full-time child care for one year costs about \$3,000 per child, or one-third of the poverty level for a family of three, according to the Defense Fund.

A family of four, living on poverty-level wages, with two children in child care, would have to spend more than half its income on child care.

Q-C PUBLIC-FUNDED CARE

Rainbow and Skip-A-Long receive funds from the Department of Children and Family Services, United Way, the Child Care Food Program—an outgrowth of the Illinois State Board of Education—parent fees and private donations.

Rainbow also receives some funds from the city of Rock Island through federal Community Development Block Grant monies.

Skip-A-Long's budget is \$500,000 per year, while Rainbow's is \$425,000. Of that, government funds cover 63 percent, said Ms. Walker.

But that fluctuates, she said, depending on division of the fee between the state and the aid recipient. Based on income, the recipient receives a certain percentage of child care services free and are responsible themselves for a portion of the fees. Those with incomes less than \$7,000 a year receive completely subsidized child care.

Typically, a single mother with two kids, making \$10,000 a year, pays \$8 a week for child care at centers like Skip-A-Long with the state paying the rest. Say she gets a raise to \$13,000 a year, then she pays \$16 a week.

Full-time, year-round work at the minimum wage of \$3.35 per hour now yields annual earnings that are less than three quarters of what is needed to lift a family of three out of the poverty level of \$9,300 a year.

The federal minimum wage today is worth only about 70 percent of its 1979 value. It has not been raised to compensate for inflation since 1981.

From 1979 to 1985 the number of people in this income bracket jumped from 2.8 million to more than 10.6 million nationwide, the Defense Fund has found.

Regardless of income or government subsidies, Skip-A-Long fees remain the same, said Ms. Walker. \$55.50 per week for preschool children, \$60.50 for toddlers and \$66.50 for infants.

Low-income family day care fees are paid through the Department of Children and

Family Services, a maximum of \$11.45 per day for full-time preschool care; \$15.78 for infants and toddlers; and \$7.89 for school-age.

Sometimes, like this year, the state gets behind on what they owe, said Ms. Walker. But she hopes it will catch up if the department receives a requested five percent increase.

Irregularities in state payments force cuts in personnel, equipment purchase or something not mandated by the state, she said.

State aid helps Skip-A-Long and centers like it, but there still are not enough slots for low-income children. Many centers aren't willing to undertake the paperwork, restrictions and regulations required to provide low-income care.

LONG WAITING LIST

Ms. Walker says that of the 143 child care slots available at Rainbow, 103 are geared to low-income children, with 50 people waiting for an open slot. Skip-A-Long has 188 slots, 84 geared to low income, with a waiting list of 250 people.

Because the state requires low-income participants be prioritized into one of eight categories, some people have to wait as much as two to three years to get their children into a program, while others are considered top priority and get in immediately.

Receiving highest priority are teen parents enrolled in high school. Next are families where the parents are employed full-time but who are still at or below 50 percent of the state median income.

Day care centers interested in providing state contracted low-income care make an application to DCFS, said Ms. Howell. DCFS will not fund too many programs in the same area.

Ms. Howell said centers are evaluated based on programs, administrative structure and capability, and parent involvement. "We try to look at administrative and structural capabilities and programmatic response."

Once accepted, day cares must continue to meet state requirements about staff qualifications, in-service training and type and quality of programs offered.

More money allocated to child care would solve a lot of the problems, lawmakers and child care experts agree. By year's end, legislation may be adopted that will give tax incentives to companies that establish child care centers for employees and grants to help cities and states set up centers.

ALLIANCE WANTS \$2.5 BILLION

The nationwide Alliance for Better Child Care has drafted legislation, called the Act for Better Child Care Services, which would authorize \$2.5 billion in new grants during fiscal year 1989. Of that, approximately \$94 million would be allocated to Illinois. Seventy-five percent of the state's allocation would be to help low-income families purchase child care.

In their report, A Children's Agenda, 1988, Voices for Illinois Children states it would like to see the day care appropriation increased to \$30 million in fiscal year 1989.

But lawmakers and child care experts agree that day care is a high priority item right now.

"Day care is a vital, instrumental portion of welfare reform. Sometimes it takes a lot of money to save money," said Sen. Jacobs.

THE PRESIDENTIAL SIGNING OF H.R. 442

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, today, President Reagan signed H.R. 442, the Civil Liberties Act of 1987. Passage of this bill will reiterate America's belief in its Constitution and reaffirm our commitment to provide "liberty and justice for all."

In 1942, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which began the relocation of over 120,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry, including over 1,000 from Hawaii. Today, we have come full circle in this story of America's reprehensible denial of constitutional rights to Americans of Japanese ancestry. After 46 years of hindsight and a decade of debate, America has finally recognized its act of grave injustice committed against Japanese Americans.

I am extremely pleased that we have favorably concluded this chapter in history. This law will help to ensure that future generations, regardless of race, color or creed, are not denied their inalienable rights in times of peace or times of crisis.

CONCERN REGARDING ROMANIA

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the initiatives of my colleagues, particularly Representatives LANTOS and DORNAN, who have sought to highlight this Chamber's concern regarding the systematic abuse of the human rights of the Hungarian minority in Romania. I also rise to join my colleagues in their strong condemnation of President Nicolae Ceausescu's regime of ethnic persecution and police terror. As one who is proud of our country's cultural diversity, I am outraged by the Romanian Government's policy of systematically destroying Hungarian heritage and culture. Such a policy clearly violates such international agreements as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act.

For the past 20 years, President Ceausescu has headed a government characterized by the abuse of human rights. His regime has attempted to eliminate the cultural identity of the Hungarian people of Romania. He is destroying all forms of expression and publication in the Hungarian language. For example, in January 1985, Romanian authorities banned television and radio broadcasting in the minority languages of Hungarian and German. Also in 1985, all university entrance examinations given in minority languages were eliminated. On July 13, 1987, the government shut down the Hungarian language textbook firm. Today, all Hungarian schools are closed.

Ceausescu's latest offense to human rights comes with his decision to bulldoze 8,000 of Romania's 13,000 villages. Many of these villages lie in Transylvania, a region ceded to Romania by Hungary after World War I. Traditionally, Transylvania has been the cradle of Hungarian history and culture. Now, the homes, churches, and graveyards of Hungarian villagers will be leveled, breaking traditional ties with the past. The resettlement of the villagers into government-owned apartment buildings termed "agro-industrial complexes," attempts to denationalize and disperse the Hungarian population. This forced assimilation is masked by government claims that, in fact, the goal is to gain more farmland for more efficient collectivized agriculture.

The Romanian Government's persecution has spurred an increasing number of Hungarians to flee Romania. Recent estimates place the number of Hungarian refugees at approximately 20,000. The significance of this number was illustrated on June 27, when Hungary tolerated a peaceful demonstration in Budapest by over 10,000 Hungarians protesting abuses to Hungarians in Romania.

Mr. Speaker, the abuses of human rights to Hungarians in Romania must end. As a first measure to stop these abuses, I encourage the President to withhold most-favored-nation trading status from Romania until reforms are undertaken. I also urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 505. We must join to preserve the human rights and cultural identity of Hungarians in Romania.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE ETHICS IN PATIENT REFER- RALS ACT OF 1988

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce H.R. 5198, the Ethics in Patient Referrals Act of 1988. This bill squarely addresses one of the most pressing problems confronting the Medicare Program today: conflicts of interest arising from physician ownership of facilities to which they make referrals.

Over 10 years ago, Congress enacted a sweeping law prohibiting payment of kickbacks for patient referrals under Medicare. The law is clear on its face: payment of any remuneration directly or indirectly overtly or covertly in return for patient referrals is prohibited subject to criminal and civil penalties.

In spite of this law, providers of medical services have developed and promoted a variety of new forms of business organization specifically intended to secure patient referrals from physicians. These ventures have been vigorously marketed as lucrative investment opportunities for physicians, and there can be little doubt from the terms of the arrangements that physicians are being paid substantial bonuses to secure referrals.

The services most commonly involved include diagnostic and therapeutic radiology, clinical labs, durable medical equipment, home health care, and home infusion therapy, including intravenous feeding.

One approach involves the establishment of a partnership. Referring physicians typically hold limited partnership shares and are not actively involved in management. The provider serves as general partner and is responsible for organizing and managing the business.

An alternative structure involves the formation of a franchise corporation wholly-owned by physician investors. The promoter is an ancillary service provider which organizes and manages the corporation for the physicians. The physician-owned corporation serves primarily as a passive billing entity and depends heavily on contractual arrangements with the promoter for actual service delivery.

Because of the resulting economic alliance between referring physicians and providers, physicians are unlikely to exercise unbiased judgment in making referral decisions. As a result, patients may not be referred to the highest quality provider available.

Based on these and other considerations, a committee of the Institute of Medicine [IOM] concluded in 1986 that "it should be regarded as unethical and unacceptable for physicians to have ownership interests in health care facilities to which they make referrals or to receive payments for making referrals." The IOM panel was composed of a group of 22 of the most distinguished leaders of American health care represented a broad range of interests and perspectives.

Physician ownership also creates a substantial risk of overutilization. This potential, in the case of lab testing, was well documented in studies by Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan in 1981 and HCFA's region V in 1983.

Finally, legitimate competition is undermined by these arrangements. To maintain market share, suppliers will be forced to compete—not on the basis of price or quality—but on the basis of the size of the cut they are willing to give to referring physicians.

Lawyers advising health care clients have recognized that joint ventures with physicians are potentially within the scope of Medicare's antikickback law, but have argued that such ventures are nonetheless permissible if (i) there is no explicit requirement that physician investors make referrals and (ii) dividend payments do not vary in proportion to the number of referrals made by the physician investor.

These claims are unsubstantiated by any court decision.

The terms of many partnership arrangements strongly suggest an intent to induce referrals. Physician investors have a clear understanding that the enterprise is likely to a commercial success if all referrals are directed to the partnership. Moreover, each physician clearly understands that profits and dividends will increase if more referrals are made.

Some partnerships explicitly restrict investment opportunities to physicians likely to make referrals. Others nominally allow participation by nonphysicians. But, of critical importance, in almost all cases, investments are rarely, if ever, solicited from nonphysicians.

Returns of over 100 percent a year are frequently projected in prospectuses accompanying partnership offerings. Dividends of this magnitude can only be explained from an economic perspective as a payment for a referral.

Nonphysician investors are not able to participate in these extraordinary dividends on

equal terms with physician investors because what the promoter really wants is an assured referral base. In other words, the formation of the partnership or corporation serves as camouflage for indirect payment of a referral fee.

Perhaps the most serious shortcoming of current law is the enormous difficulty involved in proving to the satisfaction of a judge in a criminal or civil enforcement action that a particular arrangement is deliberately structured to induce referrals. A successful prosecution requires a lengthy investigation of the business records to prove unequivocally that dividend payments to physicians were intended as the disguised payment of a referral fee.

The enforcement resources simply aren't there. There is no way that the inspector general—with fewer than 500 investigators nationwide—can adequately police the complex business arrangements that underpin the \$100 billion a year Medicare Program.

What is needed is what lawyers call a bright line rule to give providers and physicians unequivocal guidance as to the types of arrangements that are permissible and the types that are prohibited. If the law is clear and the penalties are severe, we can rely on self-enforcement in the great majority of the cases.

H.R. 5198 provides this bright-line rule. Providers of Medicare-covered services generally would be prohibited from accepting patient referrals from physicians with an ownership interest.

Exceptions are made for services typically provided as an integral part of the physician's own professional service. Thus, physicians could be part owners of hospitals or ambulatory surgery centers [ASC's] since these facilities often serve as a work-place for physicians. In addition, a physician or physician group practice could provide in-office lab testing and x rays. Furthermore, consulting physicians, such as radiologists and pathologists could own their own facilities since they generally do not make patient referrals.

Sole community rural providers would be excepted to address possible concerns about access. Ownership of publicly traded stock would be excepted since such ownership cannot involve covert payment of a referral fee. Finally, HMOs with Medicare risk contracts would be excepted because such HMO's have no incentive to encourage overutilization of referral services.

H.R. 5198 also addresses contractual arrangements for professional services or for rent or purchase of facilities, supplies, or equipment. The bill sets forth a number of strict tests to ensure that any payments made are for legitimate purposes.

Intentional violations by physicians or providers would be subject to civil penalties of up to \$15,000, assessments equal to two times the dollar value of any improper referrals, and/or exclusion from participation in Medicare.

Providers and physicians would have 1 year after enactment to bring existing ownership or compensation arrangements into compliance. A physician can easily avoid prosecution simply by selling his or her ownership interest or by referring patients to another provider.

I am introducing H.R. 5198 at this time to serve notice of my expectation that the bill be

seriously considered by the Health Subcommittee next year. Congress will receive reports on this issue from the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General by May 1989. The subcommittee will review these reports and any public comments received to develop possible modifications to the bill, including possible modifications or limitations of the exceptions currently provided.

As a final note, I would like to express my hope that the bill will be fully supported by the leadership of the medical profession. This legislation is as important to the medical profession as it is to the Medicare program.

Just 6 weeks ago, in an article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Dr. Robert Blendon reported on opinion polls which showed a significant decrease in the public's confidence in the medical profession. Dr. Blendon speculated that this decline in confidence could be the direct result of the growing "commercialization of health care."

Further proliferation of joint ventures involving providers and physicians is bound to accelerate this trend. The public will not have confidence in the medical profession if a substantial fraction of the Nation's physicians are profiting from a web of hidden commercial arrangements with health care providers to which they make referrals. The public will see little difference between these arrangements and the types of conflicts of interest which have been the focus of recent scandals involving high Government officials.

Trust is crucial to the physician-patient relationship. Ethical standards must guard against the fact and the appearance of impropriety.

The medical profession should join with us to draw the line and to demand that all who serve the public be held to the highest ethical standards.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

In General

Subject to exceptions described below, the bill prohibits a provider of any Medicare-covered service from accepting patients from a referring physician who (i) has a direct ownership or other indirect ownership or financial interest (as defined by the Secretary) in the provider or (ii) receives compensation from the provider. The prohibition also applies in the case of arrangements involving the referring physician's immediate family.

A "referring physician" is the physician who prescribes or establishes the plan of care for a service or, in the case of a referral for a physician service, such as an X-ray examination, the physician who initiates a request for a consultation. Consulting physicians, such as radiologists or pathologists, who do not make patient referrals would not be covered by the bill.

General Exceptions

(a) *Physicians' Services and Incidental Services.*—An exception would apply to physician services and incidental services (as defined in Section 1861(s)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act) provided directly by the referring physician or by another physician in the same group practice as the referring physician. A similar exception would apply to services provided by a physician assistant, nurse midwife, psychologist, or nurse anesthetist employed by the referring physician or group practice.

A physician group practice is defined as (i) a group of two or more physicians legally

organized as a partnership, professional corporation, or other similar entity, (ii) in which each physician provides substantially the full range of services which the physician routinely provides, including medical care, consultation, diagnosis, or treatment, (iii) through the joint use of equipment and personnel, (iv) with the income from the practice distributed in accordance with methods previously determined by members of the group, and (v) meeting such other requirements as the Secretary may impose. An entity which provides a narrow range of services when the individual physician members routinely provide a broader range would not be considered to be a group practice for purposes of this provision.

(b) *Prepaid Plans.*—An exception would apply to services provided by an HMO with a Medicare risk contract under Section 1876 of the Social Security Act.

(c) *Other Exceptions.*—The Secretary would be authorized to establish other exceptions by regulation for ownership or compensation arrangements that the Secretary determines do not pose risk of program or patient abuse.

Exceptions Relating to Ownership

(a) *Ownership of Publicly-Traded Securities.*—An exception would apply to ownership of investment securities (including shares, bonds, debentures, notes, or other debt instruments) traded over a publicly regulated exchange and purchased on terms generally available to the public because such ownership cannot serve as the means for covert payment of a referral fee.

(b) *Sole Rural Providers.*—Services provided by a sole community rural provider (as defined by the Secretary) would be exempted because of possible concerns about access.

(c) *Hospital and Ambulatory Surgery Center Services.*—An exception would apply to services provided by a hospital or ambulatory surgery center (ASC) with which the referring physician has a medical staff appointment provided that the ownership interest is in the hospital of ASC as a whole. This exception is provided because hospital and ASC services typically are closely integrated with the referring physician's own professional services and because physicians commonly view these facilities as part of their work environment.

(d) *Other Services Provided as an Integral Part of the Referring Physician's Service.*—An exception would be available for referrals of "medical and other health services" (as defined in Section 1861(s) of the Social Security Act) that meet the following requirements.

The service (i) must be furnished directly either by the referring physician or by employees under the direct supervision of the referring physician, (ii) in the same building in which the physician practices, (iii) using facilities, equipment, and supplies purchased or leased by the physician in an arms-length transaction at fair market value, and (iv) must not be made available to individuals not under the care of the referring physician.

Because of the potential for abuse, if the physician makes use of management services in conjunction with providing the service, the physician may not make any referrals directly or indirectly to the entity providing the management services.

No exception would be made for referrals involving durable medical equipment, ambulance services, parenteral and enteral nutrition, and home TV drug therapy since these items generally are not provided as an inte-

gral part of a physician's own professional services.

The exception would also apply to services provided by the physician group practice of which the referring physician is a member.

Exceptions for Compensation Arrangements

(a) *Fair Market Arrangements.*—An exception would apply to compensation arrangements which satisfy all of the following requirements: (i) the compensation must be for specific identifiable facilities or services, (ii) may not exceed fair market value or \$10,000 a year (except in the case of purchase or rental of facilities), (iii) may not vary based on the number of referrals made, (iv) must be made pursuant to an agreement which would be commercially reasonable even if the transaction did not involve the potential for referrals between the physician, and (v) the physician discloses to all patients referred to the provider the existence of the financial relationship and information concerning alternative sources of care.

The exception would not apply to compensation paid for professional and related services provided to individual patients by the referring physician because payment for such services is normally covered by Medicare.

The Secretary would be authorized to add additional conditions by regulation or to prohibit categories of compensation arrangements as needed to protect against potential program or patient abuse.

(b) *Physician Recruitment.*—An exception would be available for compensation provided by a hospital to a physician as an inducement for the physician to relocate in the geographic area served by the hospital and to become a member of the medical staff of the hospital so long as there is no requirement that the physician refer patients to the hospital and the compensation does not vary in proportion to the number of referrals made.

Enforcement

Payment would be denied for services provided pursuant to a prohibited referral. Knowing violations by the referring physician or provider would be subject to civil monetary penalties of up to \$15,000 for each improper referral, assessments equal to twice the dollar value of the improper referrals made, and/or exclusion from participation in Medicare.

Effective Date

The provision would be effective for referrals made on or after December 31, 1988, except that the effective date would be January 1, 1990, in the case of ownership or compensation arrangements in effect as of the date of enactment.

CELEBRATING THE ENACTMENT OF THE CIVIL LIBERTIES ACT OF 1987

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today we are celebrating the bicentennial of our great Constitution in a most fitting fashion. Today President Reagan signed into law H.R. 442, introduced as the Civil Liberties Act of 1987, and in so doing reaffirmed this vital document.

H.R. 442 may not deal with events either as distant or as proud as those in Philadelphia 200 years ago, but the bill does address events just as central and just as fundamental to our rights and to our laws.

Beginning in 1942, the Federal Government ordered and forcibly removed 120,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry to isolated camps scattered throughout the Western United States. Those who were interned and evacuated had but days—sometimes only hours—to dispose of their property and set their affairs in order. And then, carrying only what their arms could hold, these Americans were summarily shipped off to parts unknown for up to 3 years.

This legislation has been carefully drafted, after many years of debate, discussion, and hearings. In resolving the differences between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 442, the members of the conference committee further refined and strengthened an already well-crafted bill.

The major points remain, unweakened, in this legislation: an apology from the U.S. Government, compensation for survivors, an education fund to assure that such a violation of civil rights never again occurs, and review of administrative decisions and criminal convictions influenced by the hysteria of the time.

In addition, H.R. 442 now also contains redress for the Aleuts who suffered so during their evacuation and relocation.

One night in early 1942, when we did not know what events were to come, my father called the family together. He said that he did not know what the war would bring to my mother and to him, since they were prohibited by racial exclusion laws from becoming citizens. However, he was confident that his beloved country would guarantee and protect the rights of his children, American citizens all.

His confidence, as it turned out, was misplaced.

I was born in this country—as were most of those who were interned. Yet, at that time, even citizenship was not enough if your parents or grandparents had come from Japan. Without a trial, accused only because of our ancestry, we were all to be sent away from our home, first to live in horse stables at the Santa Anita racetrack, then to one small room in a tarpaper barracks in Heart Mountain, WY. I was 10½ at the time.

So, on May 29, 1942, under armed guard, my father loaded his family onto the train which was taking us from our home in San Jose to an unknown, distant barracks. He wrote to friends later that as the train pulled out of the station:

I looked at Santa Clara Street from the train over the subway. I thought, this might be the last look at my loved home city. My heart almost broke and suddenly hot tears just came pouring out. The whole family cried out and could not stop until we were out of our loved country.

We lost our homes, our businesses, our farms. But, worst of all, we lost our most basic rights. Our own Government had branded us with the unwarranted stigma of disloyalty, which clings to us still.

The burden has fallen upon us to right the wrongs of 46 years ago. Great nations demonstrate their greatness by admitting and re-

dreasing the wrongs they commit. I am proud that this Congress and this President have recognized this wrong, and have acted accordingly.

Injustice does not dim with time. We cannot wait it out; we cannot ignore it; we cannot shrug our shoulders at the past. Our only recourse is to shoulder our responsibility of refuting the shame of the internment so that such a tragedy will never recur. By enacting H.R. 442 into law we are embracing this vital responsibility.

This bill is certainly about the specific injuries suffered by a small group of Americans. But the bill's impact reaches much deeper, into the very soul of our democracy. Those of us who support this bill want not just to close the books on the sad events of 1942: we want to make certain that such blatant constitutional violations never again occur!

Does our Constitution indeed protect all of us, regardless of race or culture? Do our rights truly remain inalienable, even in times of stress; and especially in times of stress?

The enactment of this legislation answers these questions with a resounding yes.

Today is a moment of great emotion for me, a day when hopes and dreams have become reality. Today the unjust burden of shame which 120,000 loyal Americans have carried for 46 painful years has at long last been lifted.

I commend my many dear colleagues for their support of this vital legislation, and I commend the President for his wisdom in signing this bill.

My heart is full, with joy, with healing, and with pride in this great Nation, and in our great Constitution. Today the Constitution is reaffirmed as the vibrant foundation for justice and for a society which seeks equality, justice, and freedom for all.

CHILDREN'S DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution that will celebrate the first Sunday of October as National Children's Day. How many times have we referred to our children as our Nation's most valuable asset? Yet we celebrate Mother's Day and Father's Day and fail to recognize our children who play such a vital role in our families. Our children represent the future, the hope, and the inspiration of our Nation. All too often we stifle our children's dreams simply because we fail to recognize and support their achievements and aspirations. Allowing our children to fall victim to this kind of futility would be witnessing our country's dreams slip through our fingers.

Children's Day would serve as national recognition of the importance of keeping the flame alive in our children that enables them to change what is wrong, to keep what is right, and to distance themselves from the improprieties of the world. Children's Day is not intended to represent another commercial extravaganza for the local toy stores. It is a day

which would elevate the role of family life, education, and spiritualism in shaping our children's future. By encouraging schools and communities to hold appropriate celebrations and events, Children's Day would focus our Nation's attention on the positive possibilities open to our youth. When our youth believe that their contributions are valued, they will continue to follow their dreams. Children's Day is also a time for adults to reminisce about their youth or search a child's wide eyes in an effort to recapture some of the innocence and dreams that we may have lost through the years.

I hope my colleagues will join me by supporting this resolution which will provide this Nation with a golden opportunity to instill hope and pride in the youth of America.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION FOR THE SAN JUAN COUNTY NURSING HOME IN BLANDING, UT

HON. HOWARD C. NIELSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask all of my colleagues for support in assisting a small town nursing home in Blanding, UT. The nursing home, located in a rural area of Utah, has experienced increasingly difficult and complex financial and legal problems. In an attempt to resolve these problems I present this bill before this distinguished body for your consideration and approval.

In coordination with Senator HATCH, the Department of Human and Health Services, the Health Resources Service Administration [HRSA], and Mr. WAXMAN, I seek to both improve the economic state of this rural community nursing home and provide quality and efficient medical care for its deserving patrons.

The history of the nursing home's problems reveals the need for the legislation. The San Juan Nursing Home's problems resulted from complications with the Hill-Burton Program. In 1966 and 1968 the nursing home accepted Hill-Burton grants which provided funds to assist the county in constructing the nursing home and obligated them to provide a certain percentage of uncompensated health care for a period of 20 years.

During the next 20 years the long-term care facility continued to expand to meet the country's needs while the country's tax base was shrinking due to the demise of the uranium industry and the falling prices in the oil and gas market. As a result of these and other problems, the facility experienced financing challenges and, subsequently, it began to operate in the red.

Attempting to resolve the financial difficulties, the county set up a bid process and sold the nursing home to a profit-oriented organization. The amount collected from the transaction was used to pay off existing nursing home debts with the remainder to be transferred into a trust account for the San Juan Hospital in an attempt to continue serving Hill-Burton clients. These decisions and transactions were

made with the full awareness of the Denver Office of the HHS.

Presently, the Department of Health and Human Services is taking action to fine the county for the full amount of the obligation. This, I believe, will undermine the economic stability of the nursing home and the quality of health services for this community.

It is with these considerations in mind that I introduce this bill. The bill does not relinquish the county and nursing home of its Hill-Burton obligations, but rather, it mandates the county commissioner to establish a trust account in the San Juan Hospital, in an amount that will be negotiated by the HHS, that will fulfill the Hill-Burton obligation in providing community health service in the nursing home and uncompensated health care in the hospital for county residents who cannot afford the proper health care.

The honorable Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND, recently enacted a similar bill to assist a medical institution in his State. With this in mind I ask for the support of all of my distinguished colleagues in passing this legislation to improve the economic stability of this rural county in my State and more importantly to improve the health care for our Nation's senior citizens.

**IN COMMEMORATION OF THE
65TH ANNIVERSARY OF C.S.
MOTT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
IN FLINT, MI**

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation an event that will occur September 1, 1988, in Flint, MI, commemorating the establishment of the Charles Stewart Mott Community College. On this day, Mott College will celebrate its 65th anniversary.

The service this fine school has given to the Flint community can be traced back to a meeting held by the Board of Trustees of the Union School District of Flint on May 2, 1923. That day, the teachers' committee recommended that a junior college be started in September 1923, provided that at least 50 qualified freshmen applied. The motion was carried, the school was approved, and the Flint Junior college was established.

That fall, however, not 50, but 114 students enrolled at the college, attending a selection of liberal arts classes at Flint High School, now Flint Central High. Soon, young men and women, who had never even thought about attending college, had an opportunity to gain an excellent education. Consequently, the enrollment of the school quickly grew, and the Flint Junior College soon outgrew its humble location. It moved to the picturesque Oak Grove Sanatorium, its home until 1955, when the present campus was created on 54 acres generously donated by the late Charles Stewart Mott.

In 1975, responding to the needs of the community, the college expanded its campus to inner-city Flint, where a vocational skills

training and job placement center was established to assist even more residents in obtaining needed tools for good employment. Today, the college has an enrollment of over 10,000 students, with a campus of 12 buildings and more than 130 career and transfer programs.

Throughout its 65-year history, the college has gone through several name changes, starting with Flint Junior College and then Flint Community Junior College in 1960. When the college split from the Flint Board of Education in 1970, its name became Genesee Community College until finally, after the death of Mr. Mott in 1973, its name became Charles Stewart Mott Community College. Regardless of the different names and expansion of the school, one thing has remained constant: a dedication to a quality, affordable, and accessible education for the residents of Genesee County and surrounding communities.

Mr. Speaker and my fellow representatives: The seal of C.S. Mott Community College is an oak tree, an apt symbol. For like a tree, the school started very small and is ever growing and expanding, branching off into the varied subjects of modern education and constantly serving people. I ask that you all join with me in commemorating the 65th anniversary of Mott College and its contribution to the Flint community. I am proud today to rise and pay tribute to this fine college.

**CORONA CHURCH OF SEVENTH-
DAY ADVENTISTS PLANS RE-
OPENING CEREMONY**

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to praise the outstanding work of the Corona Church of Seventh-day Adventists. The Corona Church recently celebrated its 25 years of religious service to the Queens County, NY, community of Corona-East Elmhurst. It has also just recently completed an extensive renovation project that will enhance its ability to further serve its parishioners and the entire community.

The church, located at 35-30 103d Street in Corona, Queens, has a membership of 420 persons including more than 70 young people between the ages of 16 to 30. The church preaches love and obedience to God, love and respect of one's neighbors, and honor, loyalty, and obedience to the laws of State and country.

Mr. Speaker, the church places special emphasis on moral and healthy living. Its members abstain from alcohol, tobacco, narcotics, and all harmful substances. The church sponsors ongoing feeding for the homeless and needy persons and "family enrichment" and youth development programs for the community.

Based on the belief that God should be worshipped in a place of beauty, the church began an extensive renovation project in September 1985. After much hard work and sacrifice by members of the church community, and after 3 years of patient toiling, the congre-

gants' dreams have become a reality. The re-opening ceremony of the new building will take place on Saturday, August 20, 1988. The church will continue to be a guiding light for the community, and a place of refuge for all in need.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in commending the Corona Church of Seventh-day Adventists for its fine work in promoting positive values to its young people and both spiritual and physical sustenance for those who seek it. It is my honor to recognize the religious leaders Pastor Roy L. Hoyte and First Elder LeRoy Thomas. These dedicated individuals have helped make the church a vibrant spiritual center in the Corona-East Elmhurst Community.

**CHIEF GERALD M. NEWCOMBE
RETIRES**

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to set aside this time to recognize Chief Gerald (Gerry) M. Newcombe of San Bernardino, CA. Chief Newcombe will be honored on Friday, August 26, 1988, on the occasion of his retirement from the San Bernardino City Fire Department. I would like to recognize him today by saying a few words about the many accomplishments he has achieved throughout his distinguished career.

Mr. Newcombe was born in San Bernardino, CA on August 29, 1933. After graduating from Colton Union High School in 1951, he entered San Bernardino Valley College in the same year. Gerry was called to duty on April 15, 1953 where he entered the U.S. Army to serve his country in Korea.

After his discharge from the service in 1955, Mr. Newcombe worked full time for the Edison Co., while he attended college in the evening. He received his A.A. degree in 1959, and it was in 1960 that Gerry began dedicating himself to the San Bernardino Fire Department.

Gerry was promoted to engineer in February 1969 and in 1970 became captain of the department. His climb in rank commenced when he became the designated assistant training officer. In 1973, Captain Newcombe was appointed to the position of department administrative assistant by the chief.

As Gerry's career in the fire department remained successful, his education became equally notable. In 1976, Gerry graduated from California State University, San Bernardino, with a bachelor of arts degree in public administration upon which he took over the duties of deputy chief. A few years later, in 1980, Gerry assumed the role of the 17th chief of the San Bernardino Fire Department, and in 1982 he earned his masters degree in public administration from California State University, San Bernardino.

Mr. Newcombe has been extremely active and has received many awards which illustrate his dedication and loyalty to the community. Gerry is a past president of the San Ber-

San Bernardino Fire Chief's Association, was a Governor appointee to the California State Board of Fire Service, is a past chairman of the California Fire Chiefs' Association, Southern Section—Public Education Committee, and a member of the International Association of Fire Chiefs as well as the National Fire Protection Association.

Gerry's involvement in the community has gone beyond just working for the Fire Department. He sat as chairman of the board of directors of the San Bernardino Community against Drugs and also assumed a position on the board of directors for the Kiwanis Club of San Bernardino. His commitment continues as he is a current member of Native Sons of the Golden West and the U.S.C. Trojan Club.

The San Bernardino community has awarded Gerry greatly for his community involvement. In 1984, he was given the We-Tip Fire Chief of the Year Award, and in 1986 he received the Fire Chief of the Year Award by the Professional Insurance Agents of California and Nevada. Other honors include Gerry's being listed in the Who's Who of the West, and his being selected as Manager of the Year in 1987 by the San Bernardino City Management Association.

I have to say, and I think Gerry would agree, that he would not have been able to complete this success without the love and support of his wife, Barbara, and their four children, Gerry, Lynn, Janet, and Mary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in saluting Chief Gerald M. Newcombe. He serves as an exceptional example to us all for his commitment to the operation and improvement of the San Bernardino Fire Department and its surrounding community. It is with great pride and respect that I pay tribute to him today.

HONORING JUDGE MORRIS TURK

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exemplary citizen of Maryland. Judge Morris Turk retired from the Fifth Judicial Circuit Court of Maryland at the end of July.

Judge Turk has been a public servant for nearly 30 years. He was appointed chief judge of the fifth Circuit in 1975. Prior to that Judge Turk served his State and country in many capacities including as a member of the U.S. Armed Forces.

As a past director and vice-president of the Annapolis Symphony Orchestra and as a member of the Advisory Board of the Annapolis Fine Arts Foundation, Judge Turk has made important contributions to the cultural community as well.

Judge Turk's involvement in our community has been recognized by many. Among his honors are the Governor's Citation for Outstanding Service, Frontiers International Human Relations Award, and the Ambassador for Peace Award from the Jewish National Foundation.

With his wife Irene at his side, Judge Turk has made important contributions to the lives

of many Marylanders. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting an honored member of the Maryland Circuit Court and an outstanding citizen, Judge Morris Turk. We all wish him the best for the future.

THE CHILD-CARE DEBATE

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, "health care," "drugs," "social security," "family values," "education," "child care"—all catch phrases of election year politics. They sound good and pull at the heart strings of the American voter.

Thus, it's not surprising that child care has become one of the leading issues of the year. Not surprisingly, all our Presidential candidates are being seen on the evening news at day care centers.

Both BUSH and Dukakis have stated that they are profamily advocates; more than 100 bills have been introduced; hundreds of articles, reports, and studies have been published, and the Department of Labor has named child care the No. 1 labor issue. With 57 percent of mothers with young children at work today, there is no question about the seriousness of the need for available and affordable child care.

If the Government does dig deeper into child care, how far should it go? The best way to approach this problem would be to provide assistance directly to families with young children. For this reason I am supporting legislation that provides child care tax credits to all taxpayers with a dependent child under mandatory school age. While providing maximum benefits to those families with the greatest need, the legislation does not establish any new Federal spending programs.

I believe this bill is an equitable and practical approach to helping American families obtain child care. Parents should be allowed to choose the form of child care they prefer for their children, and mothers who are able or who choose to care for their children should not be penalized—this legislation achieves both of these goals.

Additionally, this child care bill provides tax incentives to businesses that operate child-care services for their employees without imposing burdensome regulations on the growing industry.

Child care will continue to be an issue of much debate not only because it is a campaign year, but because it involves a subject that is of importance to all of us—our children. Some type of program will be adopted to combat the problem and provide the best options for parents of young children. In doing so, let's hope Congress doesn't follow its normal pattern and develop a gigantic child care bureaucracy. We need child care, not more government.

THE FRANK ANNUNZIO CENTER—A FITTING TRIBUTE TO A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last month a very special event took place in Chicago to honor my good friend and respected colleague FRANK ANNUNZIO. On July 2, the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, a civic and charitable organization founded in 1952, held the grand opening of its new headquarters which is officially named the Frank Annunzio Center.

The new Annunzio Center is located on Michigan Avenue in the same building that houses the Italian Consulate in Chicago. It will be used to carry out the work of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans which includes the issuing of grants and scholarships, the organizing of the annual Columbus Day Parade and the promotion of Italian culture and heritage.

This designation is a very fitting tribute to FRANK ANNUNZIO. He has served as a principal benefactor of this organization both in helping to raise funds and in sharing his knowledge and expertise. FRANK has devoted his life to highlighting the important role that Italo-Americans have played in the history of our Nation. By his example, FRANK has deepened this pride in our common heritage which is a part of the rich tapestry of American life.

In a larger sense, the Annunzio Center will also be an enduring reminder of FRANK'S dedication to the people of the 11th Congressional District and his outstanding contributions to this Nation. As a member of the Banking Committee and the distinguished chairman of the House Administration Committee, he has been an effective leader who has earned the respect and the genuine affection of his colleagues. By working diligently to improve the quality of life for all Americans, FRANK has made a difference.

Mr. Speaker, the Frank Annunzio Center will stand as a testimony to the dedication and commitment of an outstanding public servant. I want to join with FRANK'S many friends in Illinois and across the Nation in congratulating him on this special honor.

TREAD CORP. TO EXPORT TO CHINA

HON. JIM OLIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Small Business Committee, I would like to make the Members of this body aware of growing opportunities for small businesses to export their products overseas. In my district in Virginia there are many fine small businesses, entrepreneurial in spirit and farsighted in vision. One such business is the Tread Corp.

In business for more than 30 years, Tread has become the largest manufacturer in the United States of bulk delivery, pump and blend trucks for the explosives industry. These trucks have been found to be particularly effective in surface mining.

The Tread Corp. has discovered the possibilities of establishing a business relationship with the People's Republic of China. Second only to the United States in coal production, the People's Republic of China is increasing its use of surface mining. Representatives of Tread Corp. have made trips to China and have begun the process of creating a business partnership that will provide economic opportunities for the Sixth District of Virginia and beyond.

Businesses from around the Nation manufacture and supply parts and materials to the Tread Corp. These businesses also stand to gain from the export opportunities created by Tread Corp., who plans to establish a team of industry representatives interested in joining Tread in doing business with China. The market for the goods and services of Tread and its suppliers is very strong in China and a business partnership will be mutually beneficial.

Based on the research they have already conducted, Tread sees the necessity to conduct further feasibility efforts. As part of their ability to finance this work, the company is making application to the Trade and Development Program of the U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency for grant funds. These moneys will provide background for Tread products and technology in China by providing a training program in the use of explosives and explosive equipment potential for Chinese officials. It will also support a delegation of U.S. explosive industry personnel to China for purposes of establishing a joint marketing effort.

I strongly urge the Trade and Development Program to support the efforts of these small businesses entering the international marketplace by providing a favorable response to the application of the Tread Corp. I also urge my colleagues to encourage small businesses in their districts to explore similar opportunities to export U.S. goods and services overseas.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIES FOR THE BLIND TECHNICAL CENTER

HON. JACK BUECHNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the excellent work of some of my fellow Missourians who work at the National Industries for the Blind Technical Center in St. Louis County, MO.

This center, established in 1967, has as its sole purpose the provision of technical assistance to workshops for the blind participating in the Javits-Wagner-O'Day [JWOD] Act Program. The JWOD Act, now in its 50th year, is one of the most effective employment programs ever passed by Congress and provides meaningful and remunerative employment to thousands of blind Americans nationally.

The employment of blind people in this program is made possible by Federal Government purchases of blind-made products from the workshops associated with National Industries for the Blind. These blind-made products have an impact on all Federal Government employees from the ball point pens they use to military gear for the combat soldier.

Government employees expect quality products to be provided to them so that they can accomplish their jobs in the most efficient and productive manner. Blind-made products are noted for their quality. Maintaining this high standard of quality in Government-use products is no simple task. The engineers and technicians at the NIB Technical Center provide to workshops for the blind valuable assistance in establishing and maintaining these quality programs.

I hope that all of my colleagues will share in the admiration I feel for the accomplishments of these dedicated individuals. They are helping to assure that the Federal Government is buying value for the tax dollars spent while at the same time assuring continued employment for our Nation's blind citizens.

EDWARDS AND WILKIE: CALIFORNIA'S PEACE TICKET

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with all our colleagues, and the Nation, an excellent article from the August 1988 issue of "The Golden State Report: The Magazine of Politics and Public Policy in California."

The article, entitled "Edwards and Wilkie: California's Peace Ticket," describes one of Washington's most talented couples, Congressman DON EDWARDS and Edith Wilkie, Director of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus.

As the article describes, DON EDWARDS has brought a great deal of harmony and cooperation to the largest State delegation in the House of Representatives, while Edie Wilkie has provided extraordinary staff leadership to one of the most important research and policy caucuses on Capitol Hill.

The article follows:

EDWARDS AND WILKIE, CALIFORNIA'S PEACE TICKET

(As head of the California congressional delegation, Don Edwards is replacing discord with harmony. As director of a think tank, his wife, Edith Wilkie, is promoting bipartisan support for arms control.)

(By Steven Pressman)

In an age of conservatism, Don Edwards has remained an unabashed liberal. During the Reagan era, he has stood guard over a congressional graveyard where some of the president's cherished legislative dreams have remained buried for years.

Among his colleagues in the fractious California House delegation, he has tried to be something of a peacekeeper. That's not easy, because the political Cold War that divides the state's Democratic and Republican lawmakers has proven to be an imposing obstacle to legislative *detente*.

Politics is much more harmonious in Edwards' own household. While he has long focused his energies on domestic liberal causes, Edwards' wife, Edith Wilkie, concentrates on more global matters. For the last several years, she has been the executive director of Congress' Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, a liberal-tinged bipartisan group of senators and House members.

And after 25 years in Congress, Edwards—one of three most senior members of the largest state congressional delegation—is still ready to fight new political battles. At the age of 73, he shows no signs of slowing down.

"I played four sets of tennis and 18 holes of golf the other week, and I didn't even get tired," he said recently during an interview in his Washington office with a commanding view of the Capitol. "So the old bones are still pretty active."

A glance at the rating scores that various interest groups tally up for members of Congress explains why the San Jose Democrat enjoys his reputation as a tireless fighter for liberal causes. Throughout the Reagan years, he has racked up six straight years of perfect 100 percent scores from Americans for Democratic Action, one of the bellwether tests of true liberalism. (During Ronald Reagan's first year in office, Edwards somehow slipped to a 95 percent ADA score.)

To complete the symmetry, his report card from the American Conservative Union has remained steady at zero during Reagan's two terms in the White House. Edwards probably considers the flunking mark from the conservative group as a badge of honor.

In California, Edwards represents a solidly Democratic district, to be sure. It is not, however, the kind of district that necessarily shares all of Edwards' political views. He has been an outspoken foe of just about everything that Reagan has stood for as president, and yet in his district Reagan edged out Walter Mondale in presidential balloting four years ago, largely with the help of a lot of blue-collar votes in Fremont.

Over the years, Edwards' political opponents have tried to exploit his liberalism to their advantage, but he always has managed to disarm them when balloting time comes around. He won re-election with 62 percent of the vote the same year that Reagan was carrying the district in the 1984 presidential race. Two years later, Edwards upped his total to 71 percent.

He is among the relatively few members of Congress who define their political roles beyond the boundaries of their own districts. "We're not here in Congress just to represent 550,000 people, although that's an important part of it," he says. "But we're here to help create a national and an international agenda."

During Reagan's presidency, Edwards has been spending much of his time stymying White House initiatives, while battling to enact social legislation over administration resistance. The Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, which he chairs—along with the full Judiciary Committee headed by retiring Rep. Peter Rodini, D-N.J.—has become the graveyard for cherished Reaganite goals such as a balanced budget amendment and anti-abortion measures.

Edwards and the committee also have been in the forefront of other legislative fights with the White House over issues such as reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act and a controversial civil rights

measure passed over Reagan's veto. The civil rights bill reversed a Supreme Court decision that had narrowed the scope of earlier civil rights legislation.

While Edwards' philosophical allies have cheered him on, his opponents have decried the tactics he has used to undermine some of the cornerstones of Reagan's agenda. "Your aggravation level reaches a certain point to where it becomes total frustration," says Rep. Dan Lungren, the Long Beach Republican who is leaving the House this year. A member of the Judiciary Committee, Lungren resigned from Edwards' subcommittee a few years ago over the Democrat's handling of legislation to extend the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

The flap revolved around aborted efforts to work out a compromise between Edwards and Rep. Henry Hyde of Illinois, who was the senior Republican on the panel at the time. Lungren and Hyde accused Edwards of sneaking behind their backs by negotiating with other Republicans instead. Edwards ended up apologizing to Hyde over the incident, and says the two have since patched over the bruised feelings. But Hyde, like Lungren, left the subcommittee because of what happened.

Edwards makes no apologies, however, for using his powers as a senior Democrat and subcommittee chairman to achieve or to block legislation. "You are elected to use whatever appropriate machinery there is to do what you think is best for the country and for your constituents," he says.

As chairman of the 27-member contingent of House Democrats from California, Edwards has a slightly different role to play. Not only must he try to maintain unity among the state's Democratic lawmakers, but he also must attempt whenever possible to find common cause with the 18 Republican House members on some issues affecting California. A deep political chasm between the two sides has made the bridge-building efforts nearly an impossible task.

Traditionally, the state's senior House member from each party chairs that party's delegation. Among California Democrats, Edwards shares the same seniority with Edward Roybal and Augustus Hawkins, both from Los Angeles. But neither has shown an interest in leading the delegation, so the task has fallen to Edwards ever since Rep. Harold (Bizz) Johnson was defeated in 1980.

In the years since, the Democratic delegation has hired its own staff with computer-equipped offices near the Capitol. Edwards and other delegation members say the Democratic group is more unified now, particularly when it comes to important statewide issues such as offshore oil drilling and agricultural interests.

The unification process also has been made a little easier by some changes in the internal workings of the California Democratic delegation. Gone is the domineering personality of the late Philip Burton. Another kingpin in the delegation, Tony Coelho, is busy these days climbing up the ladder that leads to the top of the overall House Democratic leadership structure.

"There used to be a lot of little power structures floating around in the delegation," says Rep. Robert Matsui, D-Sacramento. He says Edwards has managed to work effectively with the delegation as a whole, without appearing to compete individually with members on their own favorite turf. "He's got an ego," says Matsui, "but it's a very benign ego."

Relations with California's Republican House members, however, are much more

strained, particularly since the bitter fight that erupted over the 1982 reapportionment engineered by Burton. Orange County Republican Bill Dannemeyer refers scornfully to the "absolute raping" of GOP districts that took place in the 1982 remapping of political boundaries. "That raping . . . has colored the whole relationship of the two sides here in the House," he says.

Edwards, for his part, is aware that the reapportionment fight has driven a deep wedge between Democratic and Republican House members. Still, he maintains a good working relationship with Rep. Carlos Moorhead of Glendale, the dean of California House Republicans. "He (Moorhead) gets criticized by some of them for being too friendly with me. But he can accept that, and so can I," says Edwards.

The two are working on a plan to develop a bipartisan institute that would be based in Washington, where it would serve as a California-oriented think tank to promote the interests of the state. Edwards says such an operation would allow California to compete more effectively for federally funded projects that have ended up elsewhere in the past. He lists the loss of an earthquake center to Buffalo and high-technology projects to other parts of the country as evidence of the need for a better California promotional effort in Washington.

"ABC"—anything but California—is an expression around here," says Edwards, explaining the zeal with which other members of Congress challenge the flow of federal dollars to the nation's most populous state.

Strained relations within the congressional delegation obviously don't help, but Edwards also points an accusing finger at Gov. George Deukmejian, who he says doesn't seem to focus much attention on the state's affairs in Washington. "He doesn't put a hard-hitting team together, work with the Legislature and get into the national competition," Edwards says.

For those who agree with Edwards' assessment of Deukmejian, that makes two California governors in a row who have had their problems deciding how to connect the worlds of Sacramento and Washington. Jerry Brown was constantly frustrating the state's congressional delegation by appearing aloof and uncaring about state-related issues. At other times, he would journey to Washington without bothering to tell anyone that he was coming.

Edwards' own journey into the world of liberal causes began years ago in a rather unlikely fashion, when he was state chairman of the California Young Republicans.

An FBI agent in his younger days, Edwards was a business-minded member of the GOP until the age of 35. He became wealthy as the owner of a title insurance company in San Jose.

After the close of World War II, however, Edwards joined the United World Federalists, a world government group, partly in response to his growing fears about the spread of nuclear weapons.

Elected to his statewide GOP post around the same time, Edwards quickly discovered that his sympathetic views toward the United Nations and world peace issues were out of sync with most of his fellow Republicans. He severed his ties with the party and quickly became active with liberal groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union and Americans for Democratic Action.

His 1962 race for Congress marked Edwards' first foray into elective politics. He narrowly edged out two other opponents in the Democratic primary, moving on to an

easy win in November in the heavily Democratic district. Once in Washington, he continued his education as a liberal by associating with the likes of civil rights lawyer Joseph Rauh and U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Douglas and his wife Cathy.

In Congress, meanwhile, Edwards wasted no time in boldly declaring his own allegiance to political liberalism. His maiden opportunity to do so came when the House was asked to vote on a routine measure to fund the House Committee on Un-American Activities. At the time, House members voted individually by voice, as opposed to today's electronic balloting.

When the clerk called for Edwards' vote, the new congressman voted against the bill. "The clerk stopped and looked at me—and I felt every eye in the chamber on me," recalls Edwards.

"He looked and again said, 'Mr. Edwards of California?' And I said, 'Nooooo.' I think there were only about a dozen or so votes against it."

The infamous Un-American Activities Committee—which, years earlier, had helped to propel another California congressman, Richard Nixon, into the national spotlight—was not officially mothballed by the House until the early 1970s. Ironically, some of the committee's jurisdiction transferred to the Judiciary subcommittee that Edwards has chaired for years. "So I've been chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee ever since," he jokes.

He met his wife (it is Edwards' second marriage) several years ago, when she was working on another House member's staff. She later was administrative assistant to Rep. Fortney (Pete) Stark, the Alameda County Democrat, before she became executive director of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus in 1978.

Ask some otherwise knowledgeable Capitol Hill observers about the couple's relationship, and you're likely to get some quizzical glances. "Most people don't know we're married," admits Edwards. "She's a very independent person."

As for Edwards, he says he is not getting tired of serving in Congress. Four years younger than Ronald Reagan, he is already looking forward to politics in the post-Reagan era. "I hope my friends and relatives will tell me when it's time to quit. But I think it's very important to have some older people here . . . And the older I get, the more liberal I become."

CAN A WILKIE BE BIPARTISAN?

As the wife of one of the most liberal Democrats in Congress, Edith Wilkie could be expected to share naturally her husband's partisan leanings. But Wilkie—married to San Jose's Don Edwards—has her own professional responsibilities on Capitol Hill, and they require her to be more bipartisan than her political spouse.

For the past ten years, Wilkie has served as executive director of the congressional Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, a group of 135 senators and House members, that conducts research and analyzes legislation for the benefit of its members.

The fact that the current caucus chairman, Sen. Mark Hatfield of Oregon, is a Republican underscores Wilkie's point about the need for her to avoid a partisan label. "A couple of my best friends often assume that I'm a Democrat, and they assume that because I'm married to one," says Wilkie. "But I assure them that I'm bipartisan."

In fact, she blames both political parties for having avoided strong arms control positions in the past. "I think that both parties have failed to address issues in a way that a lot of people in this country and a lot of members of Congress would want them to," she says. Wilkie thinks the Democratic House leadership has become more visible recently on arms control matters, but she says the Democratic-controlled Senate "still has a way to go" on the subject.

Wilkie may prefer avoiding a Democratic label for herself, but she doesn't hesitate describing the arms control caucus as a liberally tinged group of lawmakers. (About 80 percent of members are Democratic senators and House members.) But sprinkled throughout the caucus are liberal and moderate Republicans like Hatfield and Sen. John Danforth of Missouri.

Lately, however, it has been the conservative in the White House, Ronald Reagan, who has won plaudits from arms control advocates for his administration's progress in negotiating weapons treaties with the Soviet Union.

Wilkie's own career on Capitol Hill began in 1969, when she joined the staff of Rep. Ogden Reid of New York, a Republican who later switched parties. She also worked for a few years for Rep. Fortney (Pete) Stark, an Oakland Democrat who shares Edwards' unabashed political liberalism.

From there, Wilkie moved to her current job at the arms control caucus, a group which started meeting in 1959 at informal breakfast discussions and later blossomed into a more organized operation during the Vietnam War.

Most congressional spouses play background and supporting roles when it comes to politics. But Don Edwards and Edith Wilkie enjoy going their own ways, and neither thinks the marriage poses any conflicts or difficulties with their own positions.

"We aren't really working on a day-to-day basis in the same legislative vineyards," says Wilkie, noting Edwards' focus on domestic civil rights issues.

"I may be very naive, but I truly believe there is no association here professionally (between her and her husband)," says Wilkie. "We don't even bounce around at the same parties and receptions on the Hill."

THE DEATH PENALTY DOES NOT WORK

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration's so-called war on drugs has been rhetoric without resources and symbolism without substance. It has exhorted our youth to "Just Say No" to drug abuse, while cutting the education and job training programs which enable our children to not only say no to drugs, but to say yes to a healthy and fulfilling life. It has combed every inch of the pleasure palace yachts of the rich for marijuana seeds to demonstrate its alleged "zero tolerance," but has sought to cut off the Federal aid our local police need to shut down the proliferation of crack houses in poor neighborhoods. Drug rehab programs have been starved of funds, forced to actually turn

away those desperate to free themselves of their addictions. Interdiction efforts have been chaotic and all too frequently rendered farcical by the administration's fawning over Panama's General Noriega, Haiti's Colonel Paul, and other members of the Elliot Abrams' Drug-Peddling Dictator-of-the-Month Club. Instead of actually getting tough on drugs, this administration has been content to just sound tough—and hope no one notices the difference.

But the American people have noticed and, as every opinion poll taken in the last year has discovered, they're fed up with the smoke and mirrors drug policy of the last 8 years. They want action. Both Jesse Jackson and Michael Dukakis have made the call for a coherent and tough drug policy a prominent part of their campaigns for the Presidency. Silent for 8 years, GEORGE BUSH has been scrambling to play catchup and concoct some semblance of an alternative drug policy of his own. But, unfortunately, like his boss, Mr. BUSH has turned not to law enforcement officers and other professionals battling the drug epidemic for help in fashioning his proposals, but to the same public relations hacks who are responsible for our current mess. And hence, instead of real solutions, Mr. BUSH and his party have seized on the tired, time-honored favorite of demagogic politicians everywhere who either don't know how or don't want to effectively confront crime: the death penalty. Americans who have been looking and waiting for more cops on the beat, more raids against PCP factories and crack houses, an end to foreign aid to nations that flood our streets with cocaine, and a strong coherent interdiction initiative to stop drugs at the border will have to keep waiting. The GEORGE BUSH answer to the drug crisis is a pathetic "Don't just do something—kill someone."

Beyond the barbarism and immorality of State-sponsored murder, beyond the inevitably racist and arbitrary manner in which the death penalty is applied by courts and juries in this Nation, a Federal death penalty for drug kingpins should be rejected by all Americans who are honestly concerned about mounting a real war on drugs for one simple reason: It doesn't work. As the following article from the National Law Journal of February 15, 1988, makes clear, in those States in which the death penalty is legal and aggressively pursued by prosecutors, it does not deter or reduce the incidence of crime; what it does do is create a morass of endless litigation and confusion which diverts vital Government resources away from the full enforcement of our drug laws and the prosecution of drug traffickers. The drug kingpin death penalty proposal is not an effective antidrug policy—it is a substitute for one.

[From the National Law Journal, Feb. 15, 1988]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AT THE CROSSROADS (By David A. Kaplan)

At the silent sunrise, on a cold January morning, Gary Mark Gilmore walked into an abandoned cinder block prison shed, calmly took a seat in a black chair, and the state of Utah pumped four rounds of rifle fire into his heart.

So it was in 1977 that capital punishment resumed in the United States, inaugurated by the fusillade of a volunteer firing squad

near Point of the Mountain, Utah. Before that dawn, there had not been an American execution since Aaron Mitchell was put to death in California 10 years earlier—a gridlock caused by intense litigation and legislative warfare.

Since Gilmore, 93 other inmates have gone the way of the electric chair, gas chamber, lethal needle or rifleman. In 1987 alone, 25 were executed—a total last reached in 1962. It is a significant number, for it troubles death penalty opponents and supporters alike.

"Even I am getting used to them," says Henry Schwarzschild, director of the American Civil Liberties Union's Capital Punishment Project. "But the killings are just as revolting the 25th or 90th time. Our culture seems to be in a very bad mood."

"It's a pittance," counters an assistant attorney general from one Southern state, emphasizing that the national death row population stands at just below 2,000.

U.S. Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist himself has taken note. Several years ago, while still an associate justice, he penned a dissent that skewered his Supreme Court colleagues for allowing a capital "stalemate" to develop. "The existence of the death penalty in this country is largely an illusion," Justice Rehnquist wrote. While hundreds and hundreds had been sentenced to death since the court reinstated capital punishment in 1976, he said, "virtually nothing happens except endlessly drawn-out legal proceedings."

True enough, acknowledges Richard H. Burr III of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Inc. (LDF) in New York, but he takes none of the blame. "A crazy system inevitably produces its own contradictions," he says.

TUMBRELS' HEYDAY

Each side has a point. While the annual number of executions in the United States is far from the tumbrels' heyday during the Depression (199 in 1935 was the peak), it nonetheless represents a figure unheard of in contemporary Western society. Indeed, according to London-based Amnesty International, the only major countries left in the world that regularly execute are China, South Africa, Iran and the Soviet Union. Canada, Mexico and all of Western Europe have abolished the death penalty.

But if the American system is notable for the fact that it has capital punishment at all, it is unique for the way it does not use the penalty. At the end of 1987, the national death row population stood at 1,980. That is 150 more than a year ago, twice as many as in 1982, and more than any nation in the annals of criminal justice.

Florida alone has 282 capital prisoners, tops among the country's 34 separate death rows and the largest state collection of the condemned in American history. (See accompanying charts.) Texas, despite a leading 26 lethal injections since the Gilmore execution ended the modern moratorium, is next with 258 inmates, followed by California with 211 and Illinois with 111. Louisiana, first in executions during 1987 with eight, has 46 more to go. Some inmates, on their fifth or sixth appeal, have been waiting since the mid-1970s.

In Texas, death row is a growth industry. There is enough condemned manpower to run a garment factory annexed to the row. The plant manager boasts that his workers are better than the general prison population. "I wish I had more of them," he told the Associated Press. Juries and judges will

likely oblige him; Texas officials talk of a 1,000-inmate death row within the next decade.

Creative minds have a field day with those kinds of numbers. According to Amnesty International, the American backlog of death exceeds by a factor of five the total executions in the United States and Western Europe in the last quarter-century. David I. Bruck, a Columbia, S.C., lawyer who has represented several condemned inmates, puts it more sarcastically.

Given the annual additions, he recently said, "you could execute someone every day of the week—including Sundays, Christmas, New Year's Day and Easter—and you still couldn't do it by the end of the century."

Prison officials and state attorneys downplay the significance of the figure of so many warehoused inmates. They say it's a function of all the litigation of the past 10 years and the legal safeguards that ensure fair procedures. Now that the U.S. Supreme Court has thrown out the last of the broad constitutional challenges to capital punishment—based on such issues as race and jury selection procedure—they say the pace of executions should pick up.

Even if that's true—and the experience of just the past year suggests it isn't—the backlog is remarkable. And it's intractable, unless there is a momentous surge in executions or drop in death sentences.

The choice, as Prof. Franklin E. Zimring of the University of California at Berkeley School of Law wrote in a recent book, "is between a permanent Reign of Terror or an execution policy that makes [a] mockery of the legal standards governing the use of the death penalty."

Which it will be—an unprecedented bloodbath or the institutionalizing of a grisly charade—may very well pivot on the experience of the next few years, as capital punishment, American-style, reaches a key crossroad.

ACROSS MASON-DIXON LINE

Since 1976, executions have been almost exclusively a Southern event. Indeed, four states—Texas, Florida, Georgia and Louisiana—are responsible for more than 75 percent of all U.S. executions since 1976, though those states constitute only 16 percent of the nation's population.

The Southern monopoly partially explains why the national debate over state-administered death has not been more acrimonious; that may change when and if the executioner moves north. As lethal injections and electrocutions lose their abstract quality in California, Illinois, Ohio and Pennsylvania (whose death rows make up one-quarter of the nation's condemned), something will likely give.

Hugo Adam Bedau, a professor of philosophy at Tufts University and the leading chronicler of the death penalty for a quarter-century, says American capital punishment historically has been a regional phenomenon.

He explains that "you've got the states that always execute (typically in the South); the states that never execute, whatever their laws provide (typically in New England and the populist Upper Midwest); and then the rest of the states. What happens in places like California and Pennsylvania over the next few years will determine whether we break out of that historical pattern."

"I believe the Southern states are operating at full power," says Mr. Burr of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. "California will be a turning point."

When will the executioner's song begin to include some Northern and Western stanzas? Though the California Supreme Court stalled most death cases under the now-deposed Chief Justice Rose E. Bird, convicted murderer Bobby Harris lost all his state challenges and is facing his final federal appeal. If he loses—a decision is expected roughly by summertime—San Quentin's gas chamber will go into service for the first time in 21 years.

Illinois, Ohio and Pennsylvania are somewhat behind in having their capital statutes cleared for action, but lawyers on both sides of the emotional aisle expect executions in those states by 1990.

While Professor Zimring acknowledges the significance of the Northern states, he expresses serious doubt any momentous change is in the works. "No one can tell you we won't have 200 executions a year in this country," he says. "We've been hearing every year this decade that the bloodbath is just months away. It isn't happening, and the number of states actually doing the executing is dropping. That is no accident."

At least in California, officials don't agree. Steve White, chief of the criminal division in the attorney general's office, says there will be three or four executions over the next two years, a hiatus as a bunch of cases reach federal court, and then "about 30 a year."

DEREGULATION OF DEATH

Beyond the regional phenomenon, of course, is the continuing legal struggle that gave rise in the first place to the modern era of capital punishment. Twenty years ago, as Professor Bedau points out, "the Supreme Court really hadn't heard of the death penalty."

Back then, the civil rights crusade was in full stride, in part due to the litigation efforts of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. The LDF's civil rights work led to its interest in capital punishment, and that involvement culminated in *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238 (1972), when the Supreme Court, 5-4, ruled the death penalty, as then administered in an "arbitrary and freakish" way, constituted "cruel and unusual punishment" in violation of the Eighth and 14th Amendments.

Most scholars viewed *Furman* as the executioner's death-knell, especially in light of a decade's momentum toward abolition. But such prophecies ignored the public and legislative frenzy that accompanied the court's decision. By 1976, 35 states had enacted new statutes that attempted to correct the constitutional flaws in pre-*Furman* statutes; and that year, the justices, 7-2, upheld death penalty laws as long as they provided "guided discretion" to judges and juries *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153.

The big question, never fully answered in *Furman*, was thus resolved. For the next decade, particularly the first half of it, the Supreme Court fine-tuned capital statutes—and largely in a way that further reduced the penalty's scope. Mandatory death sentences were struck down. Non-homicidal crimes, such as rape, could not be capital. (Crimes against the state, such as treason, may be an exception.) Defendants were given special procedural protections on the ground that death was different.

Such strictures, however, seemed to mean that nobody got executed. One figure in the early 1980s showed three-quarters of the capital cases before the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals (based in the South) went the defendants' way.

In the last few years—whether because of increasingly permissive jurisprudence or better-prepared prosecutors and attorneys general—the tide has turned. And the Supreme Court itself has shown impatience at the seemingly interminable delays.

"Death was different," Professor Bedau says, "but it's not very different any more."

JUSTICES AGAINST THEMSELVES

Virtually every major capital case to come before the justices in the last decade has been won by the state. That is especially ironic, given that the court seems more divided now than at any point since *Gregg*. Gone for the most part are the 7-2 votes, with Justices William J. Brennan Jr. and Thurgood Marshall filing lonely dissents. Key decisions last spring—on race and on whether a non-triggerman can nonetheless be sentenced to death—both went 5-4 against the defendants.

Justices Harry A. Blackmun and John Paul Stevens are not abolitionists, but they are far closer on the capital spectrum to the Brennan-Marshall end than to that led by Chief Justice Rehnquist. Whoever takes the currently vacant seat on the court will likely determine death doctrine in close cases; 9th Circuit Judge Anthony M. Kennedy appears to be a capital moderate.

One of the decisions last spring, *McCleskey v. Kemp*, indicates the court has come full circle. *Furman*, at its core, was a race case. *Gregg* said capital punishment had cleansed itself of such taint.

McCleskey showed the race issue persists. It isn't that of earlier decades—the *Furman* variety—in which discriminatory imposition of the death penalty against blacks was plain; in fact, of those executed since 1976, 57 percent have been white. It's more subtle, based on the race of the victim rather than that of the defendant. Of the murders resulting in all the executions of the last 11 years, 90 percent have involved white victims. And no white person who killed a black has been executed. In *McCleskey*, the court ruled such a statistical pattern of discrimination was constitutionally allowable, 107 S. Ct. 1756.

"The Supreme Court has neither the ability nor the will to face up consistently to what it has created," says the LDF's Mr. Burr.

The *McCleskey* theory, conceived by the LDF, represented the last global constitutional attack on capital punishment. So with its defeat went the viability of a 20-year strategy. The LDF, the vanguard of anti-death-penalty efforts, can no longer handle it all because there are few cases anymore that raise issues applicable to a large class of condemned inmates. With essentially individual appeals, the work falls to a decentralized and fragmented regiment of government-appointed counsel, public-interest groups and pro bono lawyers.

"It's not that we're cutting back," says the LDF's John Charles Boger, responding to what has become a popular perception. "But we obviously can't provide the comprehensive coverage we used to. Three of us here can't handle 2,000 cases."

STATE-SUPPORTED DEFENSE

Some states notably California and Florida, have taken up the shortfall—and now, in effect, fund fights against themselves. They guarantee a prisoner counsel for every round of appeals (at a total cost in the millions of dollars). In Tallahassee, for example, the Office of the Capital Collateral Representative was established several years ago—not out of altruism, but because the

bar pressed for it and, more important, the Florida Supreme Court wouldn't tolerate getting emergency petitions for stays of execution from unrepresented inmates.

Whether because of CCR or because of some novel legal questions that have arisen, Florida's pace of putting inmates in "Old Sparky" has dropped, to only one execution in 1987. "Nobody wants to see cases that are 10 years old," says Richard E. Doran, an assistant attorney general. "We do want to see cases speeded up."

They've tried. Last summer when the Louisiana electric chair was humming, Mr. Doran says the attorney general's office called its counterpart in Louisiana to ask why there had been so many executions. The answer was the pendency of *McCleskey* at the Supreme court, which had temporarily spared a whole class of prisoners.

In San Francisco, the California Appellate Project, funded by the state Supreme Court, finds lawyers for capital cases. Established in 1984, the group pays attorneys \$60 an hour. The average appeal, says Executive Director Michael G. Millman, takes between 800 and 1,000 hours.

A former public defender, Mr. Millman applauds the state for the project. "There is a crisis in representation, which the American Bar Association and the bars of many states have recognized," he says. "California is to be commended for creating CAP."

MILLIONS FOR DEATH

States providing lawyers for defendants throughout the appeals process obviously also continue to run up costs on the other side. Richard Moran, a sociologist at Mount Holyoke College, has estimated it costs prosecutors between \$500,000 and \$1.8 million to win a death sentence.

In Texas, the counsel crisis for the condemned is acute. There is no state support for appellate counsel beyond the first round of appeals, and critics there say the day is approaching when an inmate will be executed because he had no lawyer.

Tanya Coke, LDF research director, calls Texas "the vision of disaster and chaos." Lone Star Attorney General Jim Mattox calls that "nonsense."

Whatever the status quo, it isn't likely to change soon. "There's lots of publicity about how few lawyers there are on the defense side in capital cases," Mr. Mattox notes. "But what about how few we've got handling cases for the prosecution? Our entire staff for appellate work is 2½ lawyers."

"I am convinced," Mr. Mattox adds, "that the individuals we've put to death have had superior representation, at least on the appellate level. There is no rush to justice in Texas, just a crawl."

Nonetheless, the attorney general says he expects his state to pare its death row by the 1990s. "You could see 200 executions within a five-year period," he predicts, "though 100 is more likely."

And things could get interesting on Texas television, if the attorney general has his way: He wants cameras in the death chamber so citizens can see what the state is doing in their name and to maximize the punishment's deterrent impact.

"I've always thought that having executions in the dead of night in some secluded place is wrong," says Mr. Mattox, a strong supporter of capital punishment.

SYSTEM ON THE BRINK

Demands on the legal system go beyond lawyers. From the U.S. Supreme Court down to the state appeals courts, judges in-

creasingly complain about their capital burdens. Late last month, Chief Justice Rehnquist criticized the "chaotic conditions that often develop within a day or two before an execution is scheduled."

"The practical result of this," he explained, "is that judges . . . are called upon to make important constitutional decisions, often without as much time as would be ideal for making them."

Judges of federal appeals courts in the South and the supreme courts of such states as Florida say death cases take up an oppressive amount of their time and are pushing the appellate system to the brink. The courts are experimenting with different streamlining procedures to cope.

So, it seems, no one is happy with the system of capital punishment. Not the condemned. Not the advocates of the penalty. And not the lawyers and judges who are charged with making the system run. Where does this mean death is headed?

If last year is any indication, there are mixed signals.

In June, Louisiana electrocuted four men in just over a week. On a single day in August, America had its first triple execution in a generation, as Florida, Alabama and Utah all participated.

But before the run of executions, the Kansas Legislature—despite overwhelming popular support and an aggressive, new law-and-order governor—voted down a bill reinstating the death penalty.

It is a strange time.

RETIREMENT OF PARK SERVICE REGIONAL DIRECTOR MANUS J. FISH

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's parks protect some of the most valuable parts of our heritage. Here in Washington, DC, Manus J. Fish, the regional director of the National Capital Region, has shown great leadership and perseverance in protecting the national parks and the national image they project. He has consistently inspired those who work for him and with him. Jack Fish—as he is known to everybody who knows him—has worked to make sure that the parks of this Capital City complement the very reason for having a Capital City. Jack Fish, regional director since 1973, has decided to retire. I know he will be genuinely missed, and that he has set a high standard indeed for that position. It has been a pleasure working with him.

He has hosted innumerable inaugurations, parades, demonstrations, softball games, historic site tours, and visits of dignitaries from the Pope to Prime Ministers, from Presidents to the thousands and thousands of American tourists. Parks in his region include everything from the major national monuments—Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln to Prince William Forest Park to Clara Barton National Historic Site, Wolf Trap, Antietam National Battlefield Park, Harpers Ferry Park, Frederick Douglass Home, and Rock Creek Park. All of these parks contribute to American citizen understanding of our heritage and our enjoyment of the Washington area.

Park staff know well that Jack Fish can show up in the parks at any time. Whether riding horseback along the C&O Canal in the early morning or looking at the archeology of prehistoric Indian sites or the plants of Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens or the threatened battlefields at Manassas or the Fourth of July fireworks, Jack Fish has known the parks under his stewardship and takes that responsibility as seriously as one can. Especially known to his staff as a tree person, he takes particular pride in the 150,000 trees planted since 1973—especially the cherry trees he so loves. He also will be remembered for the meaningful memorials built during his tenure, including the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

It has always been apparent that here is a person who enjoys his job, even a job that has nearly infinite pressures and demands. It is also clear that here is a man who likes people.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is, unfortunately, only one Jack Fish. He is one of a kind. But I strongly believe that the demands of this region of the National Park Service require that the next regional director have many of the same qualities as Jack Fish has shown. That person must be able to keep the protection of the parks foremost and avoid allowing the job to be subverted into partisan games. I know that Jack Fish and the parks under his care have not had an easy time these past few years, and I commend him for the excellent job he has done in spite of the budget cutbacks and political interference from this administration. The next regional director needs to have the same kind of stamina, vision, and courage Jack Fish has shown. That person needs to be every bit the professional he is.

I have found Jack Fish to be a good spokesperson for the National Park Service when he has come before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and I appreciate his judgment and his dedication. I wish him the very best, know that he will be missed and look to the National Park Service to respect the good works he has done by naming his successor a person as qualified and dedicated as he.

CAPITOLA LIONS CLUB CELEBRATES 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the upcoming 25th anniversary celebration of the Capitola Host Lions Club of Capitola, CA.

The Lions Club of Capitola was established in 1963, and since that time the club has, without a doubt, lived up to its motto, "We serve." Club members have initiated and participated in countless projects to help those in need on a local level, statewide, nationally, and even internationally. Like their counterparts nationwide, the Lions of Capitola have focused particularly on the problems relating to eyesight and hearing, and helping the needy.

Mr. Speaker, in preparing this statement, I asked the Lions Club to provide me with a list of their activities. The list I received is so long I cannot hope to include all of them. However, I would like to mention some of the key work the Lions Club does on behalf of those less fortunate than they.

Among the Lions' local projects: They provide Braille writers and other services for the Doran Center for the Blind in Santa Cruz; provide equipment for the blind to the Santa Cruz County Public Schools; provide equipment for testing of hearing to Santa Cruz Public Schools; provide eyesight testing and glasses for schoolchildren and adults with limited sight; have established a local medical clinic for minor eye care; furnish white canes and seeing-eye dogs for the blind and sponsor "White Cane Day" to raise funds for the needy; help hearing impaired children attend special summer camps; support a local drug-awareness program and a student foreign-exchange program; support boys' and girls' sports activities; furnish an annual scholarship for disabled students; and help provide food baskets to the needy and help serve a senior citizens' lunch during the holiday season.

In addition to these and innumerable other local activities, the Lions participate in a number of efforts to help the needy of other countries. For example, the Lions sent funds to help rebuild schools in the wake of a major earthquake in Honduras, and they sent money, clothing, and medical supplies to help the victims of the Mexican earthquake.

Mr. Speaker, when the Lions say, "We serve," they mean it. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating them on 25 years of commitment to bettering their community and the world. I am confident that we can count on many more years of the same kind of dedication from this outstanding organization.

FAIR COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION

HON. JACK BUECHNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a lot of talk around these Chambers recently concerning fairness. Much of this has centered on the question of what constitutes an equitable distribution of power-sharing in a two-party Congress.

Perhaps the most glaring example of this inequity is the system by which representation on House committees is skewed disproportionately in favor of the majority party. It's not enough to have a statistically numerical majority of committee positions; rather, it appears the majority must occupy an inordinate number of such positions. I am told that the Marine Corps has as an unofficial motto, "Kill a Gnat With a Sledgehammer." Mr. Speaker, the House committee ratios reflect this type of thinking. But here, it's not gnats that are being squashed, but rather the right to fair representation for the American people.

When the majority party holds 60 percent of the seats in the House, as in the 100th Congress, it is fair for them to have 60 percent of

the committee seats. However, when 15 of 22 House committees reflect a disproportionate percentage of seats held by the majority, then something is wrong. When they control 70 percent of the seats on the Rules Committee, then something is wrong. And when the American people are denied fair participation in the legislative process just because their Representative happens to be a member of the minority party, then not only is something wrong, but something must be corrected.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, 20 of my colleagues, have joined me in introducing the fair committee representation amendment. This bill would amend the House rulemaking clause, article 1, section 5 of the Constitution, to provide for membership on committees, and in other legislative affairs—in the ratio of the actual party percentages. It provides that committee ratios must reflect the proportionate party membership in the respective Houses of Congress. To spell it out in plain language—use the present ratios of 60 to 40 as the baseline in the House, if a committee consists of 10 Members, then 6 Members should be of the majority party, and 4 should be Members of the minority party.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a responsibility to promote the access and participation of all our citizens in the benefits that this country offers. However, the current committee structure policy is, and will remain, tinged with hypocrisy until Congress makes the necessary corrections in its own participatory process.

NATIONAL PARALYSIS AWARENESS WEEK

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, over 500,000 Americans are victims of the tragedy of paralysis, a tragedy which can strike victims of any age, leaving them and their families faced with a lifetime of costly medical bills and difficult rehabilitation. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 636, a resolution to designate the week of October 2, 1988, as "National Paralysis Awareness Week," to call attention to the unique struggles and needs of these paralyzed citizens and their families.

A recent example of a family struck by paralysis is that of Marc Buoniconti. Marc was injured while playing football for his college team, the Citadel. While attempting to tackle an opponent, Marc dislocated his neck and suffered a complete lesion of the spinal cord. Since that tragic accident in 1985, Marc has been a quadriplegic. His father, Nick Buoniconti, through his perseverance and strength, has taken great strides to help find a cure for all paralyzed persons. The Buonicontis helped launch the Miami Project to Cure Paralysis based at the University of Miami Medical Center, which has become the most concentrated scientific effort to find a cure for paralysis in the country. Marc Buoniconti, despite his injury, serves as the project's spokesperson. The Buonicontis should be commended for their endurance and strength during this time, and they should also be recognized for bring-

ing the problem of paralysis into the public eye.

"National Paralysis Awareness Week" will hopefully increase public awareness of the tragedy of paralysis and of the great advances made, and yet to be made, in this troubling area. I urge our colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT-REID FAMILY

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding family in my congressional district. The family of Mrs. Katherine Scott-Reid of Moncks Corner, SC, has been chosen one of six families nationwide to be honored as part of the American Family Society's Sixth Annual Great American Family Awards Program. The families were selected from more than 200 finalists.

The Scott-Reid family was nominated by the National Extension Homemakers Council, one of the American Family Society's eight supporting organizations. The primary criteria used in selecting the families was leadership, nurturing individual growth, building teamwork and love, and extending friendship and service to others.

Mrs. Katherine Scott-Reid, her six adult children and their families were honored as South Carolina's Family of the Year in 1987. They are here in Washington today for a special ceremony at the White House, hosted by Mrs. Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, these are very trying times. The news today is full of stories about families with problems, bitter divorces, child and spouse abuse. The drug problem has reached epidemic proportions, our children are committing suicide and having babies. I believe strong, loving families offer a solution to some of these complex problems.

I am very proud of this Great American Family that hails from South Carolina and the Sixth Congressional District. Through their strength, love, public service, and support of one another, they set very fine examples for families across our Nation.

Mrs. Scott-Reid is a retired licensed practical nurse. She worked in a local hospital and a nursing home from 1951 to 1973. She is an active member of the New Home Baptist Church. She is also active in the Antioch Baptist Association and the Home Missions Union of the Women's Auxiliary of Upper Berkeley County.

The family's only daughter, Georgetta Scott Robinson, is employed with the Dupont Co. in Charleston. The oldest son, Rev. E. Milton Scott is co-owner and president of Holman-Scott Funeral Home and pastor of Jerusalem Baptist Church in Jamestown and Hickory Hill Baptist Church in Pineville. Pervis Scott is a supervisor for the Home Telephone Co. in Moncks Corner. Another son, Charles Scott, is a site manager for Kraft Industries in Westbury, NY. Daniel Scott is a major in the Army, stationed at Fort Bragg, NC. And the youngest

member of the family, Franklyn, is an oral and maxillofacial surgeon in Warrington, PA.

One writer has said that from the loving example of one family—a whole State becomes loving. I hope that we will be inspired by this great family to rededicate ourselves to promoting positive family values and unity.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I extend congratulations and thanks to each member of the Scott-Reid family.

GEN. JOHN W. VESSEY, JR.—
POW/MIA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's special POW/MIA Emissary, Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., recently spoke before the National League of Families about recent initiatives to gain the fullest possible accounting of American servicemen still missing in Indochina. While Vietnam's decision to temporarily suspend cooperation on humanitarian issues, such as our POW/MIA concerns, is a set back, I strongly support General Vessey's mission and the agreements he reached in Hanoi in August 1987.

I urge my colleagues to carefully review General Vessey's very insightful remarks. They provide much valuable information about the efforts America is taking to bring its POW/MIA's home:

PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL EMISSARY, GEN. JOHN W. VESSEY, JR., REMARKS BEFORE THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF POW/MIA FAMILIES

Thanks, Mr. Brooks, for the kind introduction.

Distinguished guests, officers, board members and supporters of the League, it is an honor and a privilege, as well as a humbling responsibility to be asked to be the keynote speaker at your annual dinner. Addressing a group which has just heard the President of the United States, has received a message from one of the two major candidates for the next term in that office, has heard members of Congress and representatives of every governmental agency associated with the issue at hand, would be a formidable task for anyone, but for a fellow who has been known for years as the guy with three basic speeches, one on tank maintenance, one on helicopter maintenance, and one on reenlistment, the task seems overwhelming.

Consequently, I think the best thing for me to do is not try to match any of the orators who preceded me, but just ask you to look on the few minutes I'll spend with you not as speech, but simply as an opportunity for me to bring you up-to-date on the activities in pursuit of the mission the President gave me to try to help resolve with the government of Vietnam—the issues surrounding the fates of your loved ones and our comrades, the American prisoners and missing in Southeast Asia.

The first thing I want to say to you may, in some ways, seem to be belaboring the obvious because you have already heard it from the highest levels of our governments, but on the other hand it is a very important point because it has a great deal to do with whatever progress has been made and is crucial to future progress. That is that thanks

mainly to the persistence of the League, its officers, board members, past and present, and particularly its membership and friends, this nation has an unyielding commitment to account for those who are still missing from the war in Southeast Asia. The first message I took to my Vietnamese counterpart in the negotiations was the story of strong bi-partisan support for resolving the matter, as evidenced by the unanimous support of joint resolutions of the Congress for the success of my mission. But the even more important message I tried to convey to him was that the support of the Congress was not the action of politicians acting on their own, but rather a reflection of the very, very strong support of the American people for getting to the truth in these matters. I tried as best I could to portray for him the image of the America I see with POW/MIA flags in evidence at every sort of public ceremony, the reality of POW/MIA awareness days at schools, to somehow get him to understand that in America where the citizens stop and cheer Veterans groups out marching for their missing comrades 15 years after we left the war, the issue is not going to go away. It will not be more easily resolved with a different administration, it will not get easier with the passage of time. In short, to try to convince him that now, not later, is the time to get on with the matter!

Thanks to the League's work and to the support that work has received from veterans' organizations, the bipartisan support in the Congress, and from the nation at large, I believe that the Vietnamese government officials with whom I have dealt understand the message that now is the time for action. The words you heard from our President, yesterday, should certainly reinforce the point with the Vietnamese government. My activities, as well as the activities which have ensued from the negotiations I've been involved in have been reported, faithfully, to you by our very able Executive Director, Ann Mills Griffiths. Therefore, I shall not take up your time by going into the history of my appointment as the President's Special Emissary, nor does it seem to make sense to go into a detailed rehash of every thing that has happened since my appointment. On the other hand, I do think it might be useful for me to give you my candid assessment of where we are now, and of what the next steps should be.

As I look back on what has happened in the year since our visit to Hanoi last August, I find myself with a strange mixture of feelings of frustration over the slow pace of progress and encouragement because progress has been made.

I have met twice with Vice Prime Minister Nguyen Co Thach, in Hanoi last August and in New York last month. I also met with Deputy Foreign Minister Nien last September. Those meetings have spurred six technical meetings on the POW/MIA issue as well as an orientation visit of officials of the Vietnamese Office for Seeking Missing Persons to our technical facilities in Hawaii. Colonel Joe Harvey and Colonel Johnie Webb have already told you of the latest Hanoi meeting from which they just returned. We have also had five meetings of U.S. humanitarian experts with their Vietnamese counterparts in order to help facilitate U.S. non-governmental assistance for certain Vietnamese humanitarian concerns. And we've had a visit to Vietnam of representatives of U.S. humanitarian organizations. We have also had a number of meetings on humanitarian issues beyond those of

POW/MIA. You can see that we have set up working channels of communication to deal with the U.S. humanitarian concerns and with Vietnamese humanitarian concerns.

We've had five repatriations of remains since last August. Last September we received three sets of remains and in November, five sets. Those eight were all identified. The Vietnamese turned over what they claimed were 17 sets of American remains in March, 27 sets in April and 25 more in July. Thus far, only six from the March and three from the April repatriations have been individually identified. It now appears that many of the others may not be remains of missing Americans and some may not be identifiable. The remains repatriated in July are still undergoing analysis. The Vietnamese have also provided additional information concerning the circumstances of death in some of the cases, and they have also provided us with written reports on the results of their own internal investigations into cases of missing Americans.

It is possible to put the best face or the worst face on the information I've just given you, and some of you may already have done one or the other. Some of you, like some of my colleagues, are concerned about the return of the high number of remains which turn out to be other than American—and are also concerned about the poor condition of the remains. Others are probably saying to themselves, "Can we believe those Vietnamese reports of the circumstances of death or the reports of their own internal investigations in light of our past experience with the Vietnamese?"

Let me give you my views on those points. When Vice Prime Minister Thach and I first met, we agreed that there was already enough suspicion and bitterness from the past to make us wary of each other. We agreed that nothing would be served by rehashing the past, and that if we were to build any sort of confidence it would have to start with the actions of the future. I believe that the reports of the Vietnamese will have to be judged in light of their overall actions in trying to resolve the problems which face us. I would suggest that, at this time, we take the Vietnamese efforts at face value, and make our final judgement on the credibility of their reports when we see the results of their efforts of the next few months. I am pleased that they have chosen to share their information with us, because I believe that if they truly want to resolve the POW/MIA issue, as they say they do, it can best be done by sharing the relevant information that each of us has.

We welcome Minister Thach's offer for joint survey's and investigations. As soon as we can work out the right sort of arrangements, I'm certain that cooperative activities can speed up the work, give us a chance to help and give opportunity to help build confidence in the other work being done.

As you know, I took up other humanitarian issues with the Vietnamese officials during the course of our meetings. We discussed emigration of Amerasian children, the resumption of the orderly departure program, and the release and emigration of the former South Vietnamese officials and military members who were inmates of the so-called reeducation camps. I am pleased to report to you that the Vietnamese government has moved toward real progress on all those issues. The release of most of the reeducation camp inmates, and the agreement of the Vietnamese government to negotiate procedures for permitting those who wish to come to this country were important steps.

The burning issue for me, personally, as well as for you and for the American people is the question of live prisoners. The Vietnamese authorities have consistently maintained that they hold no live U.S. prisoners. I have just as consistently maintained that before the American people, and particularly the families could accept that assurance, there are many questions which must be answered. I have continually pressed the Vietnamese to give high priority to addressing the compelling discrepancy cases, some of which were cases of those Americans for whom there was strong evidence leading us to believe they were alive after their incident and for whom there was evidence leading us to believe they were captured or otherwise came under Vietnamese control, and other cases about whom our evidence leads us to believe that Vietnamese authorities should have information. Resolving those cases satisfactorily can shed much light on the live prisoner issue. Right now, I want to say to you League members that there have been some confusing stories about my dealings with the Vietnamese on the discrepancy cases. Some of those stories might lead some people to believe that I was interested only in resolving 70 compelling discrepancy cases. That is clearly not the case! I have given the Vietnamese authorities several lists of cases which I believe are those they could move expeditiously to solve. One of those lists contained 224 names. But the more important point is that conveyed to you again by the President yesterday—the United States seeks the fullest possible accounting for all those unaccounted for from the war in Southeast Asia. As the President pointed out, eventually, we will have to decide what is the fullest possible accounting, but I would tell you that we are a long way from having to worry about that today.

Cooperation is a two way street. We agreed to help the Vietnamese with some equipment for their recovery efforts, and we will get that equipment to them. We also agreed to help the Vietnamese with certain of their humanitarian problems. Our first efforts were to help them help their cripples with prosthetic devices. A government sponsored team surveyed the problem and wrote a report which was made available to non-governmental humanitarian organizations through which the assistance would be given. Like the Vietnamese efforts on the POW/MIA issue, our efforts with the prosthetic help was slow in getting underway, but the effort is now well underway with prosthetic equipment and supplies now being delivered. A lot of people deserve special thanks for their work; we don't have time to mention them all, but Dr. Larry Ward of Ambassadors at Large, Dr. Carl Savory and Mr. Fred Downs, both combat vets of the war in Vietnam, made up the first humanitarian team and have continued to give very important support to the effort. Donations of supplies and money have come from a variety of sources, and Northwest Airlines has hauled some of the supplies to Southeast Asia without charge on a space available basis. A number of humanitarian organizations are involved, and I hope we can find a way to make their actions known to you and the American people so that they can be thanked. Our second major humanitarian effort will address child disabilities, and those activities should be underway soon. The Vietnamese are skeptical about non-governmental help for their humanitarian concerns because in their communist system, most everything that's done is done by the government. Our non-govern-

mental efforts can be an important demonstration to the Vietnamese on how they might solve some of their many problems by relying less on government and central control. So I, like the President, appeal for help for this project from those Americans able to provide it, and at the same time, I say thanks to all those who have already helped.

I had planned to talk a bit about Laos and Cambodia, but you've heard the status of negotiations with those countries from others. The only thing I'd add is that it will continue to be important to maintain a coordinated U.S. position toward all three countries and to continue to press those countries to exchange information on the POW/MIA issue as they have promised to do. I assure you that I monitor this effort as well.

Where do we go from here? Right now it is important that both we and the Vietnamese move positively and quickly to carry out the agreements we have made to address the humanitarian concerns of each other. The Vietnamese need to provide the best possible honest answers to the question, "what happened to our people?" and to return any that are alive and to help us account for the others. We must carry out our part of the agreement to help them with certain genuine humanitarian problems. We will work with the Vietnamese government to get the joint surveys and investigations underway. Success will call for understanding and cooperation on both sides. Our government's position on the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia is clear, as is the U.S. position on normalization of relations with Vietnam. I believe that normalization of relations is in the best interests of both nations, and I look forward to the day when the correct conditions have been fulfilled. In the meantime, cooperation in the humanitarian areas can help build the sort of confidence required to get to normal relations. The recent humanitarian rescue, good treatment, and quick return of the Navy fliers who went down in the Spratleys is a good example. The progress we've had on the POW/MIA and the other humanitarian issues has come because America is perceived as being united on these issues, and because Vietnam perceives its own best interests to be served by resolving the issues. Americans need to stay united on this issue. If we do, we have the chance for real progress.

Again, I want to say thanks to the League for what you've done through the years and thanks for your support on this mission I've been given. I want to tell all of you who have written to me and have not received an answer from me directly that I'm sort of a "one-man band." I don't have secretarial help in Minnesota and I'm inundated with mail. I've tried to get answers to you through the League or through the appropriate government officials, particularly those in the State Department and the Defense Department, including DIA and the Services, who have helped and at the same time tell the League members that the government has assigned good people to this very important task. Thanks also to all those members of Congress who have pushed for sensible bipartisan support, and thanks to the Veteran's organizations for your important support.

In my 46 years of wearing a uniform in the service of this great and wonderful nation of ours, the understanding that America, and particularly her Armed Forces, took care of our people was a funda-

mental premise. We pick up our wounded and get them to the best possible medical care. We recover our dead and bury them respectfully. We take care of the families of the Servicemen and women when they are sent away to do the nation's fighting. We give our veterans dignified thanks and assistance when the fighting is over. And certainly recovering our prisoners and accounting for our missing is just as important as those other points. If we ever stop doing any of those things, we have let some fundamental decay get started in the country. Thanks for helping prevent that decay. Thanks for your support and prayers.

THE TIME BOMB IN ROMANIA'S WAR ON ITS HUNGARIANS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in response to the plight of men and women whose rights are being denied in Romania. Several bills have been introduced in the House to combat these discriminatory practices. House Resolution 56, concerns the right to self-determination for all Hungarians in Transylvania. H.R. 1953 favors denying trade benefits to Romania unless the country protects the human rights and freedoms of their citizens, especially Hungarian speaking and ethnic minorities. Currently, no action has been taken on these bills; however, the Members who sponsored and cosponsored these bills should be commended for their unflinching support and promotion of democracy. These bills will force the Romanian Government to realize they must recognize human rights or they will be penalized.

Recently, the secret police increased the measures of repression. Indeed, this is in response to the unrest stemming from low-living standards. In addition, Hungarians constitute 10 percent of the Romanian population and have been relegated to the role of scapegoats. Finally, Romania mistreats not only its own people, but it mocks the free world when it ignores the final document of the Helsinki accords reference to human and minority rights. In the 1988, Freedom House survey of human rights, Romania received the lowest ranking score in Eastern Europe.

Hopefully, Congress will address these resolutions in the future. For a deeper insight into the present situation in Romania, I suggest that my colleagues read the following article "The Time Bomb in Romania's War on its Hungarians" by Peter Keresztes, which was printed in the Wall Street Journal on July 18, 1988.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 18, 1988]

THE TIME BOMB IN ROMANIA'S WAR ON ITS HUNGARIANS

(By Peter Keresztes)

Hungarian Premier Karoly Grosz met with the Soviet general secretary, Mikhail Gorbachev, in Moscow early this month, and will visit President Reagan in Washington on July 27. What may be the most critical topic in the talks—the recent flareup between Hungary and Romania—will probably

stay confidential. The controversy should not, however, be allowed to be buried in some superficial compromise, which, according to sources in Budapest, the Hungarians and Soviets are seeking. For the public manifestation of this long-simmering problem holds the potential for explosive consequences—but also for an open and fundamental solution.

The current dispute is over the revival of an old Romanian plan to raze more than half of the country's 13,000 villages. Morally repugnant and economically absurd, the scheme would knock over homes and churches, plow up cemeteries and herd the residents into "urban agro-industrial complexes". Hungary's interest is that many of the villages are in Transylvania, where most of the country's more than two million ethnic Hungarians live. A few weeks ago an estimated 100,000 people demonstrated in Budapest against Romania's village-destruction plan. Bucharest retaliated not only with a vicious verbal attack but with the unprecedented act of closing the Hungarian Consulate in Kolozvar/Cluj-Napoca and turning away Hungarian tourists. Romania has even threatened to sever diplomatic ties with its Warsaw Pact ally. Refugees from Romania have been flooding into Hungary by the thousands.

This is a major test for Hungary's new premier, who has been trying to reassure Nicolae Ceausescu that Mr. Gorbachev won't intercede and the Romanian leader can compromise with Mr. Grosz on carrying out "nationality policies consistently according to Leninist principles." Before his trip he declared, "It's a bilateral issue and not an affair of the Soviet Union."

A deal could take the form of relaxing the arbitrary restrictions at the border where normally 800,000 Hungarians cross annually, or delaying the September implementation of the village destruction or at least beginning it in pure Romanian areas. It's conceivable that Mr. Grosz will suggest to Mr. Reagan that a compromise with Romania could be facilitated if the U.S. were to restore trade preferences Bucharest renounced this year in a feud over Romanian human-rights abuses.

Such a compromise would be unconscionable and change little, for although it might resolve Romania's feud with the Hungarian regime, it would not end persecution of Romania's Hungarian minority. Romanian leaders have consistently felt that only the creation of an ethnically homogeneous Romanian state can make Transylvania secure as part of Romania. Thus denationalization has been part and parcel of the country's major domestic and foreign policies. This policy has gained in intensity at times of perceived threats, such as Hungary's strike for independence in 1956 and the current period of ethnic and political ferment in the Soviet bloc.

Some rulers during Hungary's historical domination of Transylvania, it's true, also practiced harsh nationalization on their Romanian subjects, but the effect of these activities never equaled what is happening under the current totalitarian system. The nearly 70 years of assimilation policy has effectively dispersed Hungarian communities, eroded their political voice, radically curtailed their educational and cultural lives, and has imposed severe linguistic bans. The denationalization drive has been accompanied by chauvinistic propaganda branding Hungarians as "quarrelsome," "untrustworthy," "bad Romanians," endangering the state with their "fascist" and "revi-

sionist" tendencies. Open threats and assaults on ethnic Hungarians have been all too frequent. Minority and religious activists have been incarcerated, savagely beaten, forced into emigration and even murdered by the secret police.

Hungary's Communist regimes disclaimed having anything to do with Hungarians living outside their borders. While diplomats point to behind-the-scenes representations and subtleties, such as former party chief Janos Kadar sending greetings to the Romanian "peoples"—in plural, it was only this year that Central Committee member Matyas Szuros unambiguously referred to Romania's Hungarian minority and outlined a few elements of an emerging Hungarian position on the issue.

Yet Hungarians in Romania survive. Even at official statistics that understate their numbers at 1.7 million (independent estimates are 2.1 million to 2.5 million, about 10 percent of Romania's population), Hungarians are the largest minority group in non-Soviet Eastern Europe. They are more concerned over the restoration of their rights than in seeing Messrs. Grosz and Ceausescu paper over their differences, the U.S. and Romania patching up their trade dispute, or Bucharest succeeding, as Budapest has, in striking a commercial bargain with the European Community.

The U.S., Britain, France and the Soviet Union, parties to the 1947 Paris peace accord, all share responsibility for the treatment of Eastern Europe's minorities. During those negotiations—which in the end confirmed Romanian rule in Transylvania—Bucharest promised "absolute freedom for the minority nationalities living on its territory." Business with Romania should not go on as usual while that country wages war on its own citizens and thumbs its nose at the rest of the world by, for example, killing the final document of the Helsinki review meeting in Vienna because of its references to human and minority rights.

There are serious dangers that extend beyond the borders of Romania. These lie in the increasing possibility of political collapse in Romania. Appallingly low living standards already have caused unrest; there are signs of divisions within party leadership; the military has increased its role in government, and the secret police have stepped up repression. Any breaking out of open hostilities would further incite already evident scapegoating against minorities, as well as attempts to settle scores. With the Soviet retreat from Afghanistan, Mr. Gorbachev's apparent renunciation of the Brezhnev doctrine and increasing talk about a Soviet troop pullout from Hungary, such an event would present to the Kremlin leadership a dilemma whose risks would be far greater than it would face in providing firm minority protection measures.

Soviet military intervention to end any hostilities would lose Moscow whatever credibility the regime has earned in the Gorbachev era—both internationally and among liberals at home; staying out would risk another conflagration in Eastern Europe and a conservative revolt at home. As for the West, could London, Paris and Washington sit idle—again—if Moscow felt compelled—again—to make a move in Eastern Europe? And if Moscow hesitated could the West afford not to intervene, at least with a United Nations force?

Mr. Grosz may ponder before collaborating with Mr. Ceausescu to put the nationalistic genie back in the bottle: What would, or

could, Hungary do alone were Hungarian lives endangered in Romania?

CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, 1988, Teamsters Local 557 in Maryland will celebrate its 50th year of existence. I was graciously invited to attend the celebration yet will be unable to do so because of the Republican National Convention. Local 557 is a strong and respected voice in my district, and I have come to know many of its officers very well over the years. Therefore, I would like to enter a copy of a letter I have written to Mr. Clifton McDonald, president, Teamsters Local 557, in honor of this memorable occasion. I urge you as well as all my colleagues to join me in saluting local 557 for having achieved this happy milestone.

Mr. CLIFTON McDONALD,
President, Teamsters Local 557

DEAR MR. McDONALD: It is with great honor and respect that I extend to you as well as to the entire membership of Teamsters Local 557 my heartiest congratulations and praise on the occasion of your fiftieth year of existence.

I deeply regret the fact that I am not able to be there personally due to the Republican National Convention in New Orleans. However, I have sent my District Representative, Al Dennis, to fill in for me on this very special evening. When I say that this is a "special" evening, I truly mean it. Indeed it is not often that a labor organization as venerable as 557 has the chance to reflect on all that has happened over the past half century. Tonight is a time to think back—to celebrate the accomplishments of the past and prepare for the challenges of tomorrow.

I have come to know Local 557 fairly well over the years, and I feel quite fortunate to be able to say that I had the chance to work with such men as Tom Healy, Clifford Kohne, George Willinger, and Richard Grabowski in the past. Local 557 has long been one of the dominant voices in shaping the future of the over the road and the city cartage industries. Today its membership consists of hundreds of car haulers, mechanics, and others who work for such big freight companies as Carolina and Preston.

Of course Local 557 has seen the rise and fall of many big freight companies over the five decades it has been around. The freight industry has long been an important part of our economy, and I am committed to doing whatever necessary to protect your jobs. Please believe me when I say that you all have a friend in Washington.

Once again, please accept my best wishes on this happy occasion. May Local 557 be around for another fifty years!

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO PATRICIAN ACADEMY

HON. CLAUDE HARRIS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Patrician Academy located in Butler, AL. Patrician Academy has been awarded the First Annual President's Award for Academic Excellence by the Alabama Private School Association.

The Academy was chosen from among the 51 private schools in Alabama to be the recipient of this award. The school was selected based upon several factors including teacher credentials—all teachers teaching within their field of study, scholarships received by graduating seniors, the standard achievement test scores of the student body, and district and statewide student competitions. The academy is particularly proud of its achievements in two of these areas. Thirty-one graduating seniors were awarded a total of \$157,000 in college scholarships and of these seniors, 10 scored 20 or above on the ACT college boards. Clearly, this college preparatory school, which was founded in 1970 for academic excellence, has achieved this goal admirably.

The Patrician Academy has made a significant contribution to the quality of education in Choctaw County and the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. Education is an investment in our future. The students of the Patrician Academy have now acquired the groundwork for even greater academic achievement. Congratulations to Headmistress Jeanette B. Adams, the outstanding teachers, staff, and the 285 members of the student body K through 12 of the Patrician Academy on this recognition of your success.

BILL FOR MEASURES TO COMBAT MEDICAL WASTE

HON. JOSEPH E. BRENNAN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring legislation designed to curb medical waste dumping in our oceans and inland waterways.

In recent weeks we have witnessed several localities finding medical and other waste washing ashore on our lakes and beaches. This is indeed a serious problem that is causing growing concern across the Nation.

In my State of Maine, with over 3,600 miles of coastline, many people share a deep appreciation of clean water for earning a living or recreational usage. There is strong support for legislation to keep our water clean.

The reckless and irresponsible disposal of medical waste is not only appalling, it is unacceptable. The alarming sight of our beaches being littered with dangerous debris makes this legislation necessary.

The legislation I am cosponsoring will attempt to take the profit out of using our waterways as a convenient dumping ground.

The Medical Waste Tracking and Control Act, H.R. 3478, will direct the EPA to establish minimum requirements for a tracking system for medical waste, and double penalties for dumping medical waste in the oceans, lakes, or rivers. In addition, definitions in existing statutes will be amended to include medical waste.

My colleagues, the illegal ocean disposal of medical waste is a travesty that can and should be controlled without delay.

Representative SAXTON is to be commended for introducing this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in a strong show of support for H.R. 3478, and take immediate action on this serious problem in the remaining weeks of the 100th Congress.

TRIBUTE TO HANS LAUNTZSCH OF ROSCOMMON, MI

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of our colleagues a remarkable man, Hans Launtzsch, of Roscommon, MI. I ask my colleagues here today to join me in honoring him for both his outstanding accomplishments and dedication, not only to the city of Roscommon but to the State of Michigan as a whole.

Hans Launtzsch came to the United States in 1934 at the age of four from Krogis, Germany. He and his family then became naturalized citizens of the United States, the land of opportunity and freedom.

Hans served our country in the U.S. Army from 1943 through 1946, and he was decorated with the Bronze Star. In 1948, he married Dora Jabinsky. They have three children, all of whom graduated from Michigan State University.

His dedication to the United States did not stop with his service to the armed services. Hans dedicated his career to the education of our country's children. He received his first teaching job in Houghton's Lake, MI, in 1948. Soon after that appointment, his accomplishments advanced him to becoming the assistant and acting superintendent of schools at Ecorse, MI from 1949 until 1969. Hans was involved as a director of the Community Resources Workshop for Michigan State University from 1955 until 1972 and in 1958 was appointed assistant director of the NSF Chemistry Institute for Montana State College. Most recently, Hans has served as superintendent of Gerrish-Higgins School District in Roscommon, MI, from 1971 until 1988.

His many accomplishments similarly include being the chairman of the school liaison at the Metropolitan Detroit Science Fair from 1957 through 1968, an active committee member for educating new superintendents in Michigan, a trustee for the Michigan Council for Economics Education, an executive board member of the Down River Learning Disability Center in Wyandotte, MI, and the president of the Northern Michigan Superintendents Association. He is a life member of the American

Association of School Administrators, Michigan Education Association and Phi Delta Kappa.

Hans has received many honors for his hard work and dedication to the improvement of our school system in Michigan. Some of these honors include: Who's Who Midwest 1963-88, Who's Who World 1984-88, Northern Central Accreditation for Roscommon High School in 1980, National Exemplary High School Honor 1982-83, Michigan Exemplary Middle School Honor 1983-84, board of directors School Alliance Political Action Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Hans will be retiring from the Gerrish-Higgins School District in Roscommon, MI this October. As superintendent, he has enhanced the quality of life of the children in Michigan and future of our Nation. I urge you, Representatives, to join me today in congratulating Hans Launtzsch for his outstanding accomplishments in the field of education. We commend him for his dedication and hard work, and in wishing him continued success in his retirement years.

PAMYAT: ORGANIZED ANTI- SEMITISM IN THE U.S.S.R.

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus [CHRC], which I cochair with Representatives TOM LANTOS, held a press conference this week to address the issue of anti-Semitic activities by private organizations in the Soviet Union. Eloquent statements were made by Representative LANTOS; CHRC Executive Committee Members JACK BUECHNER, JAMES SCHEUER, and BEN GILMAN; CHRC member CONNIE MORELLA; Senator TIM WIRTH; former refusenik Lev Shapiro; former refusenik Anna Rosnovsky, sister of 14-year refusenik Elena Keiss-Kuna; Jesse Hordes, Anti-Defamation League; Myrna Shinbaum, National Conference on Soviet Jews; and Judy Balint, Union of Councils for Soviet Jews.

As cochairman of the CHRC, I am very concerned about recent anti-Semitic acts in the Soviet Union. I urge my colleagues to read the following letter recently sent by 170 Members of Congress, and the statements of the other speakers at yesterday's press conference.

AUGUST 8, 1988.

His Excellency MIKHAIL GORBACHEV,
General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, The Kremlin, Moscow, RSFSR, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. GENERAL SECRETARY: We are pleased that under your leadership there have been some recent improvements in the area of human rights. We are writing today, however, with great concern over reports of renewed anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

As reported in several Western newspapers, anti-Semitic acts are currently being organized against Jews in Moscow and other cities in the Soviet Union. According to these reports, the incidents have taken the form of vandalism and violence, including the vandalization of Jewish property, the

destruction of 60 Jewish tombstones in a Moscow cemetery, threats of beatings, and anti-Semitic speeches and articles in the Soviet press.

One such reported incident involved a Jewish cultural group which attempted to rent the Yauza Club in Moscow for an organizational meeting. Reportedly, when they arrived, the doors were locked, the area was surrounded with KGB officers and a handwritten leaflet demanding "Death to the Jews" was plastered to the door.

Along with other private, public and official groups, we have strong reason to believe that Pamyat (Memory), one of the largest political activist groups in your country with 20,000 dues-paying members in Moscow alone, is significantly involved with these anti-Semitic actions. Your own press has described Pamyat leader Dmitri Vasiliev as a fanatic, and Pamyat as a dangerous organization.

This new wave of anti-Semitism is most disturbing to us, and we look to your leadership for official condemnation and a halting of such acts. As we consider human rights to be one of the highest priorities in our foreign policy, further improvements in this area, such as those you guaranteed in the Helsinki Final Act, can only enhance U.S.-Soviet relations.

In this regard, we would appreciate the courtesy of a governmental inquiry onto the activities and goals of Pamyat and other anti-Semitic groups in the USSR. We look forward to receiving a reply to this request and thank you for your consideration regarding it.

Sincerely,

170 Members of Congress.

BUECHNER AND HOUSE COLLEAGUES DECRY SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM—CALLS ON GORBACHEV TO CONDEMN ACTIVITIES OF PAMYAT

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Rep. Jack Buechner (R-Kirkwood) today sponsored a press conference with three other members of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus to deplore recent reports of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

"We oppose ugly incidents of anti-Semitism wherever they occur, but we especially oppose Soviet mistreatment, since the reign of Gorbachev is supposed to be based on an enlightened openness, not ignorance and prejudice," Buechner said.

Reports from private, public, and official groups have indicated that an activist organization, Pamyat (Memory), with a membership of nearly 20,000 in Moscow alone, is behind anti-Semitic activities, including desecration of Jewish property, and violence and slander against Soviet Jews. Sources have cataloged threats of pogroms, which have terrified the 2.5 million Jews living in the Soviet Union.

Buechner solicited the endorsement of nearly 200 of his House colleagues in sending a letter to Gorbachev condemning Pamyat and the Soviet state-supported anti-Semitic activities.

"This new wave of anti-Semitism is most disturbing to us, and we look to your leadership for official condemnation and halting of such acts," Buechner wrote in his letter to Gorbachev. "As we consider human rights to be one of the highest priorities of our foreign policy, further improvements in this area, such as those you guaranteed in the Helsinki Final Act, can only enhance U.S.-Soviet relations."

Buechner's letter urges the Soviet government to inquire into the activities and goals

of Pamyat, and other apparent anti-Semitic organizations.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER AT A HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS PRESS CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Having been to the Soviet Union several times and arrested there for standing up for human rights, I watch the changes that occur under the leadership of General Secretary Gorbachev with both optimism and caution.

I commend Mr. Gorbachev for his leadership in promoting "glasnost", which has allowed for greater freedom for most Soviet citizens, and ostensibly less harassment for Soviet Jews. At the same time, however, other officials in the Soviet government appear to be giving their tacit support to an antisemitic organization called Pamyat (translation—"memory").

Formed to preserve Russian culture, Pamyat has since poisoned its message with virulent antisemitism including age-old lies from the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion", a conspiracy theory from the turn of the century that Jews were scheming to take over the world. The "Protocols" were later used by Hitler as a source for "Mein Kampf".

In recent months, there has been a dramatic rise in anti-semitic incidents throughout the Soviet Union. These include the distribution of leaflets calling for "Death to Jews", threats of violence during the celebration of the Millennium of the Ukrainian Church, and the desecration of tombstones in the Leningrad Jewish cemetery.

Influential leaders have apparently provided Pamyat with special privileges, which has allowed it to spread its message more easily than other groups. This has helped Pamyat become one of the Soviet Union's largest political groups outside of the Communist party.

The 2.5 million Jews in the Soviet Union have nowhere to turn for protection except to the Soviet government. I call on Mr. Gorbachev to condemn the antisemitic activities of Pamyat and protect the basic human rights of Jews as guaranteed by the Soviet legal code.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE TOM LANTOS

Recent developments in the Soviet Union under General Secretary Gorbachev's policies of "glasnost" have brought a new hope for improvements in human rights. The momentum of change brings with it new types of problems that were previously suffocated by Soviet censorship and force. One of the current phenomena is the formation of independent organizations and clubs that are concerned with a myriad of topics that range from "historical preservation" to "human rights issues" to "knitting." We welcome this new prospect of freedom of association and expression.

Nevertheless, we are beginning to observe human rights violations fomented by one of these voluntary groups, "PAMYAT." In recent months, Jews throughout the Soviet Union have been threatened by activities of "PAMYAT," including desecration of Jewish property, violence and slander against Soviet Jews, as well as announcements of pending pogroms. These activities that are clearly anti-semitic are a dangerous threat to the Jews of the Soviet Union.

"Glasnost" must not be used as an excuse for persecuting a national minority. The rights of Soviet Jews must be acknowledged

and protected. The anti-semitic activities of "PAMYAT" that have taken place must be investigated and future attacks on the Soviet Jews must be prevented.

As Co-Chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus I will ensure that the conditions of Soviet Jews remain on the top of issues of the Caucus and thus continually on the agenda of the U.S. Congress.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN PORTER

I would like to commend Representative Jack Buechner (R-MO) and James Scheuer (D-NY), Executive Committee members of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus (CHRC), for bringing this important issue to the attention of the Caucus in such a timely fashion.

The CHRC, co-chaired by myself and Congressman Tom Lantos (D-CA), is a 160 bipartisan member congressional organization committed to ending human rights violations worldwide. We focus on individual cases and broader human rights issues in countries as far apart as Tibet, South Africa, the Soviet Union and Brazil. The Human Rights Caucus believes that human rights are indivisible—that the denial of fundamental freedoms anywhere is a threat to free men and women everywhere.

Over forty years ago, millions of Jews were murdered while the rest of the world was silent. Today, hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews continue to be denied exit visas, to practice their religion, and to celebrate religious holidays. Although life for Soviet Jews has somewhat improved during the current era of "glasnost," we must not overlook the anti-Semitic attitude which is permeating Soviet society.

In the Soviet Union, where anti-Semitism has deep historical roots, anti-Semitic threats have recently surfaced. The activities of Pamyat (translation: Memory), the largest pro-Russian political activist group, and other organizations are causing fear among Jews, non-Jews and government officials in the Soviet Union and abroad. The overturning of tombstones in the Leningrad Jewish cemetery, anti-Semitic propaganda distributed by a group called "Death to the Yids," and threats of pogroms following the June celebration of the millennium of Christianity should not be ignored by the rest of the world.

A letter signed by 170 Members of Congress is being sent today to Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev, Ambassador Yuri Dubinin and Secretary Alexander Yakovlev. An identical letter is currently circulating around the Senate.

This letter asks the Soviet government to express official condemnation of recent anti-Semitic acts, and suggests that a governmental inquiry be made into the activities and goals of Pamyat and other groups rumored to be anti-Semitic. This clearly demonstrates that, although we support freedom of speech and expression, we are also concerned about the fate of Soviet citizens.

The 2.5 million Jews living in the Soviet Union deserve the protection of their government from groups who seek to oppress them. Like U.S. citizens who deserve protection from the KKK, Soviet Jews deserve protection from Pamyat.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 8, 1988.

HIS EXCELLENCY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV,
General Secretary, Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, the Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R., RSFSR.

DEAR GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV: We are pleased to see that progressive ideas such as Glasnost are presently playing an important role in the Soviet Union. Our hopes are high that these enlightened concepts will be fully realized.

It has come to our attention, however, that anti-Semitism is festering beneath the surface of progress. We are especially concerned about an organization called Pamyat. This organization is the fastest growing non-official group in the Soviet Union, and is a major force in the recent escalation of anti-Semitism in your country. It accuses international Zionism of undermining Russian culture and its leader cites from the long-discredited "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" to support his claims of Zionist plots and domination.

Rumors of pogroms have circulated due to existence of this anti-Semitic group. We are alarmed that Jews are still the target of these threats as well as the victims of threatening phone calls, physical threats, slanderous posters and press, and the desecration of their cemeteries. It is the extremist Pamyat that is propagating this rise in anti-Semitism.

To quote Izvestia, "Lies cannot be considered a point of view and slander cannot be considered an opinion." We enthusiastically encourage complete freedom of expression, but it is the obligation of responsible leaders to condemn immoral points of view.

In addition, we have received continued reports that Jewish citizens are still denied a place to meet or protest, Kol Yisrael is constantly jammed, harassment during religious rights continues, and anti-Semitism still pervades the ranks of the Soviet government. In short, your reforms appear to have brought no change in Jewish life.

We urge you to act to protect Jewish nationals by dealing decisively with the perilous threat of Pamyat and extending the full benefits of your reforms to this minority group. We thank you for your attention to this matter and look forward to receiving your reply.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE J. SMITH.

STATEMENT BY JESS N. HORDES, ASSOCIATE
DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON OFFICE

This week marks the 36th anniversary of an infamous time in Soviet history—the Night of the Murdered Poets. On Aug. 12, 1952, 24 leading Jewish intellectuals, poets and writers were executed in Lubyanka prison because they were guilty of being Jewish. This act was a culmination of a campaign to crush all forms of Jewish culture in Soviet life.

Under glasnost, the "openness" introduced by General Secretary Gorbachev, Soviet citizens are finally confronting the murderous tyranny of the Stalin era. But the Kremlin has yet to face up to this, one of the most notorious single incidents of Stalin's rampages. The memory of these 24 has been effaced for most Russians, they are still "unpersons".

This raises a broader question regarding the significance of glasnost for human rights progress among Soviet Jewry. While emigration of Soviet Jews is at its highest point since 1979 and most prominent refuseniks and Prisoners of Zion have been re-

leased, the vast majority of Jews wishing to emigrate are denied this right and the numbers allowed to emigrate remain far below the numbers of the late 1970's. And while Soviet authorities are now prepared to tolerate in limited circumstances some unofficial Jewish cultural activities, little of importance has changed as Jews still await the right to study their heritage and history—a right guaranteed by the Helsinki Accords.

Moreover, despite the promise of glasnost, the persistence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union constitutes a major problem and source of concern. Whereas in the recent past, anti-Semitism has been shrouded in anonymity or euphemism, under glasnost it has become more open and direct. Officially sanctioned organizations like Pamyat have seen glasnost as an opportunity to vent their anti-Semitism publicly.

The actions of Pamyat, one of the largest political activist groups in the Soviet Union, raises serious concerns. Pamyat, a force behind the recent upsurge of anti-Semitism, including vandalism, violence and intimidation, is reportedly responsible for the leaflets recently circulated calling for "Death to the Jews" and asking "How long can we tolerate the dirty Jews who have penetrated our society?" Formed to protect Russian historical treasures, the group, which apparently has ties to elements in the Soviet hierarchy, exhibits a traditional anti-Semitism which blames the Jews for all of Russia's problems.

The Soviet authorities must take firm measures to curb this anti-Semitism. While some anti-semitic groups have been criticized by the government, the scope of their activities will expand unless strong measures are adopted against them. Soviet law which makes ethnic and racial incitement a criminal offense, has not been used. A governmental inquiry into Pamyat and other such groups coupled with strong official condemnation of anti-Semitism from the top leadership are needed.

How can the openness of glasnost be squared with the invectives against Jews that persist in some Soviet publications? How can the Soviet government ignore the problems posed by the anti-semitic, nationalist Pamyat movement? Is it not possible for the Kremlin to issue a strong signal of displeasure instead of according Pamyat official neutrality? These questions constitute an important litmus test for glasnost—to determine the possibilities of democratization and humaneness under Gorbachev.

We must not become complacent. We must continue to make it known to the Soviets that the observance of human rights is absolutely vital, and will remain an important yardstick by which the improving U.S.-Soviet relations will be measured.

STATEMENT BY MYRNA SHINBAUM, DIRECTOR,
NCSJ, AT A PRESS CONFERENCE CONVENED
BY THE CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS
CAUCUS

WASHINGTON, DC, August 9, 1988.—One of the most disconcerting by-products of "glasnost" is the tacit support offered by the Soviet authorities to ultra-nationalistic anti-Semitic organizations such as "Pamyat" (Memory).

Founded in 1980 by employees of the USSR Ministry of Aviation Industry ostensibly for the noble purpose of preserving historic monuments, "Pamyat" has in fact become a vehicle for the expression of virulent anti-Semitism, which is against Soviet law.

While "Pamyat's" true motives have been exposed in some of the Soviet media, there is strong evidence to suggest that the organization has official sanction, evidenced by its holding of "official" public meetings; reception of "Pamyat" delegations by high Soviet officials, including Boris Yeltsin, a former top Communist Party leader; and the failure of authorities to charge the organization with incitement of anti-Semitism and racial hostility, crimes under Article 74 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

In recent months, there has been a dramatic rise in anti-Semitic incidents throughout the Soviet Union, including vandalization of cemeteries and synagogues, anti-Jewish demonstrations in Moscow and Leningrad, and increasing publication of anti-Semitic articles in the media.

In his meeting with President Reagan at Spaso House on May 30, during the Moscow summit, seventeen-year "secrecy" refusenik Yuli Kosharovsky, a leading activist in the Soviet Jewry movement, stated: "... A large amount of anti-Semitic literature is being published and distributed. Pogrom inciting organizations flourish under glasnost. The authorities, which claim to deplore previous evil, continue to perpetuate its results."

The Soviet response to President Reagan's genuine concern for Soviet Jewry is exemplified by the comment of Georgi Arbatov, head of the USA-Canada Institute, and a key advisor to General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, who stated recently that President Reagan's "pressure" on Jewish issues will result in increased anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

The NCSJ views official Soviet reaction to "Pamyat" as a litmus test of the leadership's self-proclaimed humanist aspirations. Therefore, we call upon the authorities to take immediate action against "Pamyat," and other demonstrably anti-Semitic organizations, by demanding the immediate cessation of their illegal propaganda, and by prosecuting those organizations which continue to violate Soviet law by disseminating their hate-filled and vicious lies.

We call upon the Soviet Union to bring glasnost to Soviet Jews: to legitimize Hebrew classes, a Moscow Jewish Association, Jewish clubs, cafes, publications, libraries and whatever cultural and religious institutions Soviet Jews request.

We also call upon Soviet authorities to fulfill its obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Accords, and other international agreements to grant the Soviet Union's two-million Jews their basic human rights: Freedom to emigrate, and religious and cultural rights within the Soviet Union.

STATEMENT OF THE UNION OF COUNCILS FOR
SOVIET JEWS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL
HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

The leadership of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews recently returned from an in-depth fact-finding mission on the current status of Jews in the Soviet Union. During dozens of meetings in Moscow and Leningrad, they heard of the accelerating surge of the violent and historic grassroots anti-Semitism which has been liberated under "glasnost." The overriding impression that they received was that calls for pogroms and violence during recent months have created a pervasive atmosphere of fear among Jews.

Jewish activists in Moscow, Kiev, Odessa, and especially Leningrad, have provided ex-

tensive documentation of Pamyat's activities, such as you heard today.

Reportedly, Pamyat now claims 20,000 members in Moscow alone, and has organized branches in 40 other Soviet cities. These figures make it the country's largest political group outside of the Communist Party.

There has been an increase in the number of anti-Semitic incidents throughout the Soviet Union. On April 20, 1988, for example, 80 gravestones in the Jewish cemetery in Orsha, Belorussia, were simply destroyed. In May, graves were violated in Jewish cemeteries in Dnepropetrovsk, Odessa, and Moscow.

Incidents such as these have drawn the attention of non-Jewish as well. In February of this year, UCSJ released an "open letter" signed by non-Jewish intellectuals and dissidents who warned, that if they and others did not speak out against the rising tide of anti-Semitism as characterized by the growth and strength of the nationalistic Pamyat organization, they feared the return of the pogroms.

Even the idea of a pogrom in this day and age of glasnost should be unthinkable, yet once again these Jews are forced to consider this threat.

This pogrom atmosphere has created a heightened sense of uncertainty and danger, driving the surge in applications and requests for invitations in recent months. Tens of thousands of Soviet Jews took the first step in the application process in the early months of 1988, a dramatic increase from previous years.

Anti-Semitism is, of course, ubiquitous, but in the USSR it is a historic part of the culture and inherent in the Russian character. Jews have always been the scapegoats of Russians. But now Pamyat, in its traditional outcry of nationalism, has put the Jews in double jeopardy. But playing on the fact that many Jews were Bolsheviks during the Revolution, the nationalists, who yearn for the days of the Czar, claim that the Czar was shot by a Jewish family, and ultimately blame the Jews for bringing the Bolsheviks to power.

But the Jews cannot find security and safety within the Bolshevik system, either, because this very same system blames the Jews for the stagnation of the country, and considers them traitors for emigrating to Israel.

So the Jews are caught in the middle: hated by the nationalists for defeating and in fact murdering the Czar, and hated by the current regime for their commitment to their culture.

What are the Jews to do when they have no allies in neither the official nor unofficial camps? What are the Jews to do when they have to run away from both their society and government? No wonder the number of applications for emigration has increased so dramatically in recent months.

The Union of Councils for Soviet Jews commends Congressmen Lantos, Buechner, Porter, and Scheuer for their recent letter to Secretary Gorbachev, demanding an official inquiry into Pamyat activities. Our job continues to demand that we monitor Pamyat and ensure that the appointed victims are protected.

ECONOMIC RECORD SAYS THAT VOTERS, ESPECIALLY WOMEN, SHOULD BE SUPPORTING BUSH

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the political pundits around town are repeatedly pointing to the supposed "gender gap" as a major voting hurdle for the Presidential campaign of Vice President GEORGE BUSH. If one listens to the so-called experts on the editorial pages of such newspapers as The Washington Post and The New York Times the would-be Republican nominee has virtually lost the election. Of course, when one looks at the facts from the past 6 years—the economic growth, job expansion, and stifling of double digit inflation, a different picture appears for women. The former Chairman of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisers, and his wife Kathleen, correct the misrepresentations by some of the Reagan-Bush economic record in a recent column appearing in the Los Angeles Times.

ECONOMIC RECORD SAYS THAT VOTERS, ESPECIALLY WOMEN, SHOULD BE SUPPORTING BUSH

(By Martin Feldstein and Kathleen Feldstein)

The ability of George Bush to convey his economic message as successfully to women as to men may be the critical factor in this election. An acute problem for the Bush campaign is that, at present, female voters seem to be less influenced than are males by the strong economy of the last several years.

In past presidential elections, a good economic performance with low inflation and strong growth consistently favored the incumbent party. We are puzzled by Bush's underdog status in the current polls because we cannot imagine a stronger economic performance going into a presidential campaign. The United States has had almost six years of economic expansion, by a comfortable margin the longest peacetime expansion in the past 50 years. Unemployment has come down to about 5.5 percent, the lowest level in more than a decade. Inflation is only about 4 percent, compared to the double-digit levels of 1980 when the Republicans defeated the Democrats on a largely economic platform. And interest rates are about half what they were at that time.

The polls showing that the strong economic performance is not having the usual effect in this campaign also indicate that Bush trails Michael S. Dukakis because of weaker support among female voters. It's important to ask, therefore, why women are apparently less influenced than men by good economic performance.

The most obvious possibility, that it has not benefited women as much as it has men, is simply contrary to the facts. The economic expansion and government policies of the past eight years have permitted female employment to rise sharply and to result in better jobs for women. During the Carter years, the female unemployment rate averaged about 1.5 percentage points higher than the male rate. By 1987 the rates were equal, and in 1988 the female unemployment rate has actually fallen below the

male rate. It's no longer true that women are last in and first out of work.

Perhaps of even greater significance for many female voters, the earnings gap has been shrinking. Among full-time workers, women's earnings have been rising 20% faster than men's during the 1980s.

Women are undoubtedly aware of the important progress on inflation since 1980. Women still do most of the family shopping and so they must know the record here, at least subconsciously. If the double-digit inflation that existed at the start of this decade had continued, prices would be more than 75% higher today than they actually are.

In the 1980 campaign Ronald Reagan made successful use of the question. "Are you better off today than you were four years ago?" Women should be asking that same question of themselves today and comparing their position vis-a-vis their male counterparts with the situation in 1980. Their progress has been real and it has been very significant.

Perhaps the political gender gap has worsened for reasons unrelated to the economy. The conventional wisdom is that women are more concerned with social issues than are men. But social issues are closely related to the performance of the economy. A strong and growing economy allows a society to put more resources into areas like education and health care. Women who rate these issues highest on their agenda should be pushing for more spending on these programs, but they still should opt for the strongest possible economic performance.

It doesn't seem likely that peace and international security are negative factors for Bush, based not only on the very good record of the last eight years but more importantly on his background and expertise. This is one area where experience counts more than the platitudes that speech writers are so good at reinventing.

Another possible explanation of the political gender gap is that women worry more about the budget deficit than men do. If that is so, let us hope that they examine very carefully the two candidates' approaches for dealing with that deficit. While Bush has offered a specific plan for balancing the federal budget, Gov. Dukakis has been deliberately vague. Judging by the Dukakis approach to dealing with the current Massachusetts state deficit, for which he must bear full responsibility, a big increase in taxes would be inevitable in a Dukakis presidency.

The irony is that the governor is trying to turn the country's favorable economic performance of the past seven years to his own advantage. He has stated repeatedly that jobs are what this campaign is all about. If so, the economic record makes it clear that Americans should be voting for George Bush, not Michael Dukakis.

ROMANIAN HUMAN RIGHTS UPDATE—1988

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Romania enjoyed most-favored nation status from 1975 until February of this year, when Romanian officials informed the United States Government that

their country would no longer accept most-favored nation trading status subject to the terms of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Prior to the February announcement, both the House and the Senate had attached language to a trade bill before Congress which would have suspended Romania's MFN status for at least 6 months. Ironically, that language was deleted from both versions of the trade bill just 1 week before Romania announced its decision to unilaterally renounce most-favored-nation status.

Romania's surprise announcement came in response to growing criticism in the United States Congress over the past several years. This criticism centered on Romania's poor human rights performance. Although most-favored-nation status is tied explicitly to emigration, implicitly it is contingent on Romania's performance in a wide range of human rights areas. Each year, as the Congress weighed continued extension of most-favored-nation status to Romania, it focused closely on that country's record in both human rights and human contacts. The Romanian authorities considered this attention unjust interference in its internal affairs.

The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe monitors human rights trends in Romania, as well as other Helsinki signatory countries, year-round. Even in the absence of annual most-favored-nation status hearings, the Commission attaches great importance to providing a balanced, up-to-date review of Romania's record to the Congress.

The Commission has traditionally categorized its human rights concerns in regard to Romania into four areas: emigration, prisoners of conscience, religious rights, and minority rights. Poor Romanian performance in a fifth area of concern, social and economic rights, has fueled further concern over the situation in that country.

EMIGRATION

A large number of Romanian citizens has emigrated from that country over the past year. By far the largest proportion have left illegally, with an estimated 10,000 fleeing across the border into Hungary or simply overstaying their temporary Romanian visas while visiting Hungary or other countries over the past year. Others have crossed the border into Yugoslavia.

As the attached charts indicate, the rate of legal Romanian emigration to the United States has declined. This decreasing rate is cause for serious concern. It is, however, too early to determine whether Romania's renunciation of most-favored nation status will result in lower emigration rates to this country, since in the past the emigration rate has regularly increased during the second half of the year. At the time of the renunciation, Romanian authorities declared that emigration would not be affected.

The rate of emigration to the United States through the first 7 months of 1988 is almost 40 percent lower than for the comparable period in 1987. The rate for August 1987-July 1988 stands at 2,130, whereas for August 1986-July 1987 it was 2,347. Thus, the annual rate has decreased 9 percent. The January through July rate of Romanian emigration to Israel has likewise decreased from 747 in 1987 to 691 this year. The August 1987

through July 1988 rate for Israel, 1,571, does, however, represent an increase over the rate for the previous year, which was 1,472.

Of the 174 cases on the Commission's list of unresolved Romanian human contracts cases presented to the Romanian Government in September 1987, 101, or 60 percent, have either departed from Romania or have received Romanian exit permission. This approval rate is consistent with the rate in past years. But difficult cases remain on the list. Napoleon Fodor remains separated from his wife and son, whose efforts to leave Romania beginning in 1982 have been rejected time and again by Romanian authorities.

MONTHLY ROMANIAN EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL, 1987

	United States	Israel
1987		
January.....	82	116
February.....	97	101
March.....	130	105
April.....	200	106
May.....	291	95
June.....	304	123
July.....	248	101
August.....	244	200
September.....	336	171
October.....	236	165
November.....	249	154
December.....	233	190
1988		
January.....	124	102
February.....	89	125
March.....	119	150
April.....	137	106
May.....	91	78
June.....	145	41
July.....	127	89
Total (January-July).....	832	691

ANNUAL ROMANIAN EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES, ISRAEL, AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, 1971-86

Year	United States	Israel	FRG
1971.....	362	1,900	NA
1972.....	348	1,000	NA
1973.....	469	1,400	NA
1974.....	407	1,700	NA
Most-favored-nation trading status granted—1975:			
1975.....	890	12,000	4,085
1976.....	1,021	1,989	2,720
1977.....	1,240	1,334	9,237
1978.....	1,666	1,140	9,827
1979.....	1,552	976	7,957
1980.....	2,886	1,061	12,946
1981.....	2,352	1,012	8,619
1982.....	2,381	1,474	11,546
1983.....	3,499	1,331	13,957
1984.....	4,545	1,908	14,831
1985.....	2,913	1,327	13,072
1986.....	1,996	1,281	13,130
1987.....	2,670	1,627	13,994

NA—Not available.
* Approximate.

PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

The number of political prisoners incarcerated in Romania is unknown. These prisoners include individuals who have protested the authorities' denial of permission for them to leave the country. They also include people who have attempted to exercise their freedom of movement as guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by leaving Romania without following the officially decreed and very arduous emigration procedures.

A limited amnesty was declared on October 26, 1987, in celebration of Socialist Romania's 40th anniversary. A more far-reaching amnes-

ty in January of this year freed a much higher number of people, including prisoners of conscience Victor Opris, a Pentecostal pastor, and political activists Ion Bugan and Gheorghe Nastescu. Charges against Nelu Prodan, a lawyer specializing in the defense of the rights of religious believers, were likewise dropped in connection with the amnesty. Prodan had been taken into custody for 12 days in December and charged with accepting bribes.

An undetermined number of people—variously estimated from several hundred to 2,000—was detained after the riots in Brasov in November 1987. It is not known how long they were detained or whether any still remain in custody. The January amnesty should have encompassed the Brasov demonstrators still in detention, unless they were convicted of crimes with sentences of over 10 years—in which their sentences were halved.

In April, at least two Romanian citizens, Nicolae Stancescu and Mihai Pavelescu, were arrested and held for granting interviews critical of regime policies to foreign journalists. Stancescu was released in June. Four others were said to be arrested in Iasi after participating in such interviews.

Ion Puiu, who was a leader of the National Peasant Party—which was banned in 1948—and who was a vocal supporter of the 1986 declaration signed by over 120 East European activists on the anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956, was arrested in early February 1988. In poor health, he is reported to be out and awaiting trial on charges of treason. Florian Russu, who was active in the National Peasant Youth and the Romanian Association for the Defense of Human Rights, was also reported to be in detention. The charges against him are unknown.

One particularly disturbing case to come to light in the past year involves Baptist Nestor Corneliu Popescu, who has been confined to a psychiatric hospital since October 1987 in response to his outspoken criticism of Romanian policies. Popescu, his family and Western diplomats familiar with the case maintain that he is sane. The abuse of psychiatry for political ends constitutes a particularly horrifying human rights violation. Psychiatric abuse has been a problem in the past, but the extent to which it has been practiced is unknown.

RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

Religious rights in Romania are still seriously threatened. Some believers, and those like lawyer Nelu Prodan who defend them, are subject to various forms of harassment. An intensive antireligious press campaign has been apparent over the past year.

Obtaining religious texts, especially for members of churches other than the Orthodox Church, continues to be a problem in Romania. A breakthrough in the area of religious rights occurred in summer 1986 with the Romanian agreement to print 5,000 Cornilescu-Baptist-Bibles by the end of the year, as well as sufficient numbers in subsequent years to satisfy demand. The 5,000 Bibles were printed and distributed in 1987. The Baptist General Union has requested a printing of additional Bibles.

Churches and other religious buildings still risk destruction as President Ceausescu's sis-

tematizarea—radical restructuring—campaign continues. In past years urban churches have been bulldozed in the process of urban renewal. Village churches also face the threat of destruction, along with the villages themselves, as Ceausescu's drastic modernization drive reaches the countryside.

In September 1987 the 18th-century Sfintu Spiridon Orthodox Church was destroyed. The Romanian Government has yet to allow a large Bucharest Adventist congregation to move into new, permanent quarters after the August 1986 razing of its church. The Adventists have proposed a number of sites, all of which the authorities have rejected. However, Bucharest's Cuibul Cu Barza church has been transferred to another location instead of being demolished. And during the past year, a Timisoara Baptist congregation received permission to buy a new, larger building to replace its current one, which is slated for destruction.

MINORITY RIGHTS

President Ceausescu's brand of rabid nationalism is taking a toll on the Hungarians, Germans and other national minorities in Romania. They face diminishing opportunities to be educated in their own language and maintain a culture separate from Romanian culture.

There has been no improvement in the situation of the Hungarian minority since last year; Hungarian nongovernmental organizations report that the situation has only worsened. Hungarian-language theaters and publishing houses have been shut down or merged with Romanian-language ones. Family and cultural contacts across the Romanian-Hungarian border are hampered, and Hungarian visitors to Transylvania are harassed.

Official control over Romanian citizens' freedom of movement has resulted in Hungarians being transferred—through job assignments, for example—to predominantly Romanian areas, while Romanians are placed in what were homogenous Hungarian areas. Ethnic Hungarians living in Transylvania told Helsinki Commission staffers last August that in effect the cities of Brasov, Cluj, and Targu Mures have been closed to in-migration by Hungarians.

By law, primary school education is still available in minority languages for classes in which at least eight students are enrolled. Romanian officials told a Helsinki Commission delegation last August that a minimum of 26 minority students is necessary to form a class being taught in the minority language. But teachers proficient in minority languages are in short supply in the areas where the minorities are concentrated. Because the Government assigns graduates places of residence, Hungarian and German-speaking teachers often find themselves teaching in overwhelmingly Romanian areas, where Romanian is the language of teaching.

In recent months President Ceausescu has indicated he will step up his plan to eradicate 7,000 to 8,000 villages and replace them with large, modern conglomerates inhabited by former villagers by the year 2,000. Up to 10 million people could be forced to relocate if the plan is implemented.

The projected destruction of centuries-old villages represents a full-scale attack on cultural rights. Homes, cemeteries and church-

es—all of which are imbued with historical significance for the communities, as well as providing the very framework of village life—are to be bulldozed. The Hungarian community is particularly distraught over losing another tie to its culture. Hungarians fear they will be dispersed and merged into communities of mixed ethnic character, perhaps far from their ancestral homes, further hampering their ability to preserve and transmit their heritage. The "agro-industrial center" campaign likewise will adversely affect ethnic Romanians and Germans living in the villages.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

The economic situation in Romania continues to deteriorate, as last fall's workers' riots in Brasov, Romania's second largest city, demonstrated. The immediate impetus to the rioting was the unexpected implementation of President Ceausescu's decree that workers' wages would be cut if their plant's production quotas were not met.

Fuel has been rationed for several years, leaving many people in apartments and offices which are heated to just over freezing. The street-lights in Bucharest—a capital once compared to Paris for its atmosphere—are no longer turned on at night. Basic foods, including milk and bread, are rationed. Meat is scarcely available. Malnutrition has appeared in the country. It appears that all of Romanian society—outside the Party and Ceausescu family elite—is suffering equally.

Decades of financial misplanning have led to the dire condition of the Romanian economy, making it the poorest in Europe after Albania. The Government has continued to pay back its foreign debts and engage in a modernization campaign for the country at the expense of the Romanian people. The agro-industrial center plan is but the starkest example of this phenomenon. Many cities, including Bucharest, already have suffered tremendous losses in architectural landmarks and cultural treasures as Ceausescu has sought to drastically remake the face of Romania.

ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the widespread concern that has been demonstrated by the press in Los Angeles about proposals to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. Three editorials from the Los Angeles Times follow that clearly outline the travesty that would result from opening up ANWR to drilling. I hope my colleagues will review these carefully.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 18, 1988]
GO SLOW IN ALASKA

Congress should put a halt to any further action this year on legislation to lease the National Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska for oil and gas exploration and production. The Reagan Administration has so badly bungled its campaign in behalf of leasing in the refuge that it has no credibility left on the issue. The decision should be

left to the next Administration and a new Congress beginning in January 1989.

In 1987 the Department of the Interior issued an environmental-impact report on the Arctic refuge proposal that was so blatantly pro-leasing that it even drew the condemnation of the Environmental Protection Agency. The report clearly under-estimated the impact of oil exploration and drilling in the refuge and failed to consider sufficient alternatives to all-out leasing, the EPA said.

Significantly, the EPA also said that it was inappropriate for the Interior Department to conclude that environmental damage would be held to reasonable limits in the same manner as at the big oil development at Prudhoe Bay to the west. The data failed to support any such conclusion, the regional EPA administrator said.

In any event it now is clear that Prudhoe Bay is not such a great example to emulate. In a new report that was suppressed by Interior officials, the department's Fish and Wildlife Service has concluded that environmental damage at Prudhoe Bay is far greater than had been envisioned when production was begun and the Trans-Alaska Pipeline built. "These impacts are presently occurring and will probably increase in the foreseeable future," according to the report that was written by the Fish and Wildlife Service's office in Fairbanks.

The report undercuts the oft-heard boasts of oilmen and Interior Secretary Donald P. Hodel that the Prudhoe Bay development blends so with the wilderness that the local caribou herd has tripled in size. The Fish and Wildlife report says that the increase in caribou numbers may be attributable to the "killing, removal or displacement" of bears and wolves, the caribou's natural predators.

Hodel and others have contended that Arctic refuge disruption would not be as extensive as that of Prudhoe Bay. Interior's own study predicts that oil production would directly affect only 12,650 acres of the 15-million-acre area proposed for leasing. But that would be even more than the 11,000 acres of wildlife lost at Prudhoe Bay, which itself is almost double what had been predicted. The Fish and Wildlife Service also notes that the topography of the two regions varies widely, and so too could the impact. In fact, Arctic refuge is far from the "flat, desolate landscape" that is portrayed in at least one oil company brochure. The Wilderness Society's description of "America's Serengeti" is more appropriate.

Finally, the Reagan Administration has failed to respond convincingly to critics who contend that a coherent national energy policy could meet the country's needs without having to disrupt the Arctic refuge, where geologists say that there is a 19 percent chance of finding a major oil field of several billion barrels or more. A new Administration and new Congress should have the opportunity to draft a rational energy program, incorporating conservation and alternative sources, before deciding whether to drill the Arctic refuge or to preserve it as a wilderness area.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 3, 1986]

THE REAL ENERGY CRISIS

The Interior Department has set up a new environmental confrontation with Congress that it seems certain to lose. The issue this time is oil and gas development on the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The 1.55 million acres in question should have been set aside as wilderness back in 1980 when Congress passed

the Alaska Lands Act. That concession to development interests should be rectified now.

The 1980 law required the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service to report in five years on the area's petroleum potential and environmental assets. Officials had five alternatives to present to Secretary Donald P. Hodel, ranging from preservation of the area as wilderness to all-out development. Other options included the drilling of exploration wells to determine if there was sufficient oil to justify commercial development.

The Interior officials chose the worst of the five—to lease the entire area now. The rationale is familiar to anyone who has followed Interior's attempts to throw open the California coastline to offshore drilling: National security mandates the development of all the domestic supplies it can.

Interior would control operations to protect the environment. Even so, the report concludes: "Long-term losses in fish and wildlife resources, subsistence uses (by Alaska natives) and wilderness values would be the inevitable consequences of a long-term commitment to oil and gas development, production and transportation."

By opting for full development, Interior seems to have guaranteed the defeat of its proposal, although Hodel has time to revise it before it goes to Congress in the spring for approval.

The nation needs the oil. But there is a basic flaw in the Administration's zeal for drilling everywhere and anywhere. It has keyed the U.S. energy future to a no-win option. No matter how much the wildcatters find, domestic supplies cannot keep up with current levels of consumption. The nation would run out of oil, perhaps in the 21st Century.

But there is no policy for dealing with that inevitable event. There is no viable program of synthetic-petroleum production. There is no development of alternative fuels such as methanol that could provide an orderly transition to the future. When Congress produces energy-saving legislation, such as appliance efficiency standards, the President vetoes it. Mass-transit programs are opposed or discouraged. Conservation is a forgotten word in the temporary flush of cheap imported oil. Higher gasoline taxes and import tariffs are eschewed even though they would discourage imports and encourage domestic production.

Interior declares, on the basis of geological assumptions, that the Arctic refuge might contain 30 billion barrels of oil. That sounds like real energy security, for perhaps a decade. But read the fine print. At best, only 9.2 billion barrels are recoverable. The statistical chances are good that the field would yield only about 3 billion barrels. That is not security, but merely a brief postponement of the inevitable.

Interior officials warn that rampant oil development with no concern for the environment will occur if the oil is "locked up" until a national crisis occurs. But the present policy guarantees that the crisis will occur sooner, not later. The only path to true energy security is a balanced program that weans us from our imprudent diet of petroleum overconsumption. Arctic oil still might be needed. Or it might not.

[From the Los Angeles Times, April 23, 1987]

EXPLORATION VS. WILDLIFE

No one was shocked when Secretary of the Interior Donald P. Hodel proposed to

Congress that 1.5 million acres of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska be leased to oil companies for oil and gas exploration and development. Hodel has been Interior Secretary for two years, but he acts as if he were still running the Energy Department.

The only surprise was the extent to which his report ignored the wilderness value of the unspoiled Arctic plain and the extent to which he claimed that national security hinges on the ability to wring every last drop of oil from the refuge. The only people who may have a reasonable idea of the oil potential of the area are not telling. They are the handful of oilmen who know the results of a 14,500-foot-deep test well drilled on native land in the midst of the wildlife refuge about 100 miles east of Alaska's Prudhoe Bay field. There is said to be a definite gleam in their eyes.

The results of the test well drilled near the native village of Kaktovik fall into the realm of "proprietary information." This means that it is the oil companies' secret, not to be shared with the 250 million Americans who are custodians of the adjacent wildlife preserve. All that the oilmen will say is what Hodel mimics: The refuge may contain the nation's last big onshore oil field.

Therein lies a major flaw in the nation's current policy of leasing federal lands for oil and gas activity. It virtually always is an all-or-nothing proposition, with the oil boys deciding where to drill and when. All that the rest of us are told is that there may be a one-in-five chance that the Arctic refuge might yield anywhere from 600 million to 9.2 billion barrels of oil. There might be none, or there might be more.

Let it be said also that rhetoric from the other side of this battle often is not much more illuminating. Environmental groups claim that oil development will do grave damage to the Porcupine caribou herd that migrates into the Arctic plain to calve. They claim that the oil companies are willing to destroy one of the last great natural areas of the country for a quick buck.

So the battle is joined at high moral and emotional pitch, with Congress asked to decide between Hodel's request to open up the refuge to leasing and the environmentalists' demand that it be preserved as wilderness area.

The flight could be waged more intelligently if Hodel had not abdicated his responsibility as the nation's chief environmental officer in making this recommendation. He rejected other options including limited leasing, further exploration and taking no action—that is, to allow the area to remain as a refuge with no drilling at this time.

Environmentalists have focused on the caribou. In response, Hodel's report went to considerable lengths to argue that while oil development might have "major effects" on the caribou habitat, there would be no major adverse effects on the herd.

Hodel dismissed the wilderness value of the unique mountain-to-ocean ecosystem as unworthy of consideration, since there is so much wilderness in Alaska already. He carried this absurd argument to the extreme by saying that oil development "ultimately will be in the best interests of preserving the environmental values of the coastal plain." But in the same statement he said that the effects of oil production would "include widespread, long-term changes in the wilderness character of the region."

In fact, major oil production would create a new industrial complex on the Arctic plain

with roads, pipelines, housing, an operations center, processing facilities, land disruption and air pollution. It would alter the environment for decades at least. The American people, acting through Congress, may ultimately decide that the oil is worth the sacrifice. But they should not be forced to make that decision on the basis of incomplete and misleading information from their own government.

MATT GILLESPIE, LEHIGH VALLEY LEGEND

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, Matt Gillespie, loved by thousands in the Lehigh Valley as a great band leader, died recently after being stricken while giving his final show, a music lesson. That was his trademark, making people happy.

I had the pleasure of sharing many good times with this special man who entertained the valley for nearly 60 years. All of us will miss him. I know he will be missed not only as an entertainer, but also as a teacher and a friend.

He was truly a gentleman—caring, compassionate, and a giving person, not only of his talents but of himself. I was fortunate to have Matt as a friend and I am pleased to have this opportunity to submit these remarks in his memory.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the August 2, 1988, issue of the Allentown Morning Call on the passing of Matt Gillespie.

HEART ATTACK KILLS MATT GILLESPIE AT 72

(By Cheryl Wenner)

Renowned Lehigh Valley bandleader Matt Gillespie died yesterday after being stricken while giving a music lesson in Bethlehem.

Gillespie, 72, was pronounced dead at 3:03 p.m. in the emergency room of Muhlenberg Hospital Center by Dr. Jose Guzman. Death was attributed to cardiac arrest.

The affable piano player, who made his professional debut playing for silent movies when he was 13, was remembered fondly last night by friends and other area musicians, several of whom mentioned the encouragement Gillespie gave them when they were young.

"The nice thing I remember about Matt was when I was just getting started in the business," recalled band leader Parke Frankenfield from his home in Florida. "He was playing a gig with his big band in the Moose Auditorium in Easton and kindly allowed me to come up and sit in on trumpet."

That helped give him confidence, Frankenfield said, "He really encouraged me."

"Through the years, we've always been good friends, even though we were musically competitive," said Frankenfield. "I always admired him and respected him."

"He called me the last time he was down here in Florida, within the last six months, to say hello and wish me well."

"We'll miss him," he said.

Saxophonist Willie Restum joined Gillespie's band at 16 and played with the group for seven years. Last night, he recalled the man who gave him his start.

"They called him a local band leader. He just happened to be a band leader locally. He was a great band leader," he said respectfully.

Restum, now of California, credited Gillespie with instruction and allowing him to become a band personality. He said Gillespie went to "great lengths" to help young musicians achieve.

"Matt had compassion for his fellow man and especially had compassion for his fellow musician," he said.

Restum characterized Gillespie's musical style as progressive, innovative and experimental.

Bandleader Joe Resetar of Hellertown remembered Gillespie as "a very fine musician and a very wonderful friend."

"We never really worked together. We both had our own bands and we were both piano players so we really couldn't work together," he said. "But we always stayed in touch."

Gillespie grew up in Catasauqua, where his attraction to music was fostered by his mother, Dorothy, a pianist who played for silent movies and minstrels, and his father Quay.

His parents wanted him to play the banjo. Gillespie recalled in a 1981 interview for *The Morning Call's* Neighbors section. "I didn't like banjo; I want to play piano," he said. Ironically, the first band he played with in high school was a banjo band that used the piano as "an extra instrument."

His first instructor, Russ McKeever, taught him the basics of classical piano, but young Gillespie wanted lessons from Allentown jazz pianist Roxy Rief, who played for the silent films in Catasauqua's Majestic Theatre. For his 10th Birthday, he got his wish.

Gillespie made his professional debut at 13, substituting for Reif at the Majestic's Saturday afternoon silents. Because he was under 16, Gillespie needed special approval for membership in the Allentown Musicians Union Local 561.

By the time he was 16, Gillespie was already giving piano lessons to neighborhood children, playing in high school bands, and later for vaudeville and burlesque performances at Allentown's Lyric Theatre—now Symphony Hall. He joined Bob McClister's band, The London Critterions, and began touring and playing Lehigh Valley dance halls.

During those years, he accompanied such famous vocalists as Sophie Tucker, Martha Raye, Milton Berle, Lillian Roth, Lou Holtz and Fannie Brice.

In 1981, Gillespie recalled an appearance at a posh testimonial dinner for Postmaster General James Farley at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in New York. "All of Washington turned out, all of the big shots" he said. "I remember I embarrassed the band when I brought in the music wearing my leather jacket with CHS [Catasauqua High School] on the back."

After graduation in 1933, there were stints with Piff Moore, a trio organized by Bill Thompson, and various cruise ship dance bands. In 1941, newly married to singer Margie Smith and earning \$25 a week performing, he traded his music for a job in the manufacturing division at Bethlehem Steel Corp.

In late 1944, he joined Harry Romig's band. When Romig retired from the business in 1946, he took over the band. It was the first year the Matt Gillespie name appeared on the bandstand and the first of 35 years the Gillespie band would play the Allen High School prom.

By 1950, Gillespie's men were playing alongside the Dorseys, Woody Herman, Stan Kenton, Russ Morgan, Glenn Miller and other big bands of the day. Gillespie's band became known for its arrangements.

Gillespie continually taught music and accompanied many of the big-name entertainers who have performed in and around the Valley, including Bob Hope, Liberace, Herb Alpert, Kenny Rogers, Perry Como, Kate Smith and Johnny Carson.

Ken Harkins, one of his former students, worked as an accompanist for Frank Sinatra. And jazz pianist Keith Jarrett learned his chords from Gillespie, who introduced him to the Lehigh Valley at his jazz concerts at Moravian College and West Park.

Gillespie was an unsuccessful Republican candidate for Bethlehem City Council in 1973, 1975 and 1977. He gave up politics after that but never left his piano silent for very long.

Last year, Gillespie's Big Band kicked off the fourth annual Musikfest with a performance at the annual Musikfest Ball in the Hotel Bethlehem, and earlier this year the group appeared at Mayfair in Allentown. He performed regularly at the Encore Room of the Holiday Inn East and the Lehigh Valley Club in Allentown, among others.

Gillespie never doubted the timeless appeal of Big Band music. "People will always be interested in dance music," he once said. "When we play for the regular dancing crowd and the youth crowd, we have to play a mixture of ballads, jitterbug, rock'n'roll and music of the past. But, you can always tell they're happy when you see a smile on their faces. That's what makes it so wonderful. For me, it will be music all the time til the end."

BIPARTISANSHIP AND THE CONTRAS: DID YOU EVER SEE A DREAM DYING?

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, after disapproving military assistance to the Nicaraguan resistance this February, Congress voted on March 30 to resume humanitarian aid to maintain them as a potential fighting force. This was designed to keep pressure on both the resistance and the Sandinista government to negotiate in good faith. On August 16, the Senate essentially renewed this provision for another 6 months, although negotiations deadlocked and were broken off in June.

Proponents of this approach initially argued that to give negotiations a chance might evoke the congressional consensus that has been lacking. The majority promised to work with the minority in a spirit of comity. Democrats rejected Republican worries that the Sandinistas would drag out the negotiations while consolidating their military position and scorned suggestions that to abandon the established delivery system would be folly. The Democratic leadership won swing votes by vowing to hold the Sandinistas to pledges of democratization.

These fragile hopes for democracy and promises of cooperation now lie shattered like shards of glass along the road behind us.

Both the House and the Senate now are even more bitterly divided and Central America policy is more contentious than 20 weeks ago. The Democratic leadership has seemed blind to Managua's bad faith and has hunted down the slightest pretext for delaying distribution of humanitarian aid. Many Contra supporters believe the Democratic leadership seeks not a satisfactory, agreed peace, but rather the negotiated surrender of the democratic resistance. Recent experience appears to confirm this, and battle lines have hardened accordingly.

The law authorized immediate food and other humanitarian assistance to Contras inside Nicaragua at agreed-upon cease-fire zones. After the vote, however, in an about-face, the Sandinistas insisted that final agreement on these zones required the Contras to surrender their arms. The resistance understandably refused: At Sapoia they had agreed to a cease-fire, not unilateral disarmament.

The Sandinistas then said they would shoot down any aircraft delivering humanitarian aid to the cease-fire zones. Unlike CIA, the Agency for International Development [AID] and private groups authorized to deliver Contra assistance are not equipped to evade a shoot-down. So to this day, thousands of Contras inside Nicaragua have received no regular resupply, although negotiations dragged out and the 60-day cease-fire that began April 1 unofficially remains in effect.

Meanwhile, because all aid had been cut off in February, most of the Contras literally had run out of food before humanitarian assistance administered by AID began trickling to the Honduran border on April 19. Deliveries inside Honduras and AID's subsequent decision to dispense Nicaraguan money to be hand-carried into Nicaragua for Contra purchase of food aroused a storm of protest. Individuals within and designated by the Democratic leadership began to call AID, seeking to impose a unilateral, partisan interpretation of what the Agency could not do under the law—that is, that they could not do anything to help the Contras, even though much of the projected 60-day cease-fire period had by then elapsed, and food deliveries were far behind schedule. AID had to answer to seven different congressional committees, all controlled by Democrats, which micromanaged the program and applied hostile pressure. The Democratic Study Group published a special report charging illegalities in seven different areas, a General Accounting Office investigation was threatened and a resolution of inquiry demanding wholesale turnover of documents began circulating. Only belatedly, and after much adverse publicity to the program, did the Democrats quietly acknowledge these charges were unfounded and withdraw the resolution.

Democrats opposing the Contras should have been satisfied that their legislation in any case gave the Sandinistas an immense advantage. Military aid to the Contras was cut off in February and might never be reinstated, even if there is no remaining hope for a fair, negotiated settlement. All the Contras get is \$17.7 million every 6 months to keep them from starving and to ease the conscience of some Democrats. The Sandinistas, however,

continued to receive Soviet bloc military and economic aid worth hundreds of millions. They are repositioning themselves in militarily advantageous ways while the Contras are being forced to pull out of Nicaragua because they lack even food, some of them suffering from malnutrition.

Media and other sources indicate the Sandinistas immediately began exploiting their advantages to consolidate their positions and marshal forces for a major offensive to wipe out the Contras if the cease-fire ends. Before the February aid cutoff, intelligence, media, and defector reports all portrayed large gains by the resistance, which had secured the tactical advantage and momentum. But by April, numerous members of the elated Sandinista leadership were bragging repeatedly that when the fighting begins again, they will be in a position to wipe out the resistance with an offensive of unprecedented scope, and that they fully intend to do so.

After a brief respite, the Sandinistas soon began to harass newly opened press and radio outlets via denial of newsprint and temporary broadcast bans; beginning in July, the opposition media once more was completely shut down for prolonged periods. The Government continued to rough up and arrest political party and labor leaders, a tactic which also escalated lately to trial and imprisonment. The agreements forced the Sandinistas to allow some demonstrations and political activity, but they compensated by unleashing the "divine mobs" to attack and bully the opposition; last month, the mobs were supplemented with notorious police-administered beatings and arrests at a July 10 opposition demonstration in Nandaime. The Sandinistas has informed the opposition that it will be countered with violence. The Government has been largely successful in intimidating the opposition's four major sources of support—the media, the church, labor unions, and U.S. diplomats who were expelled on trumped-up charges.

In the meantime, Speaker WRIGHT, questioned whether Managua was responsible for problems in the negotiations, said he doesn't lay blame because he doesn't know what happened—despite his close consultative relationship with the Sandinistas and the fact that he is primarily responsible for pressing the talks. Such attitudes prompted editors of the Washington Post to observe that the negotiations upon which Congress insisted are destroying the Contras and imposing a Sandinista "peace" without democracy. "Is it conceivable," the Post queried, "that DAVID BONIOR'S Democrats could stop chasing ghosts and playing political games and bring themselves to be marginally helpful in a (Contra) cause they insist they embrace, or at least stop hurting them?" The House reaction to the bludgeonings, imprisonment, and expulsions associated with the July 10 Nandaime civil demonstrations was a toothless resolution of condemnation, but no hint of renewed military aid to the Contras.

One revealing reason for the Democratic Study Group's opposition to cash payments for the Contras did emerge. The May 16 DSG study warned about giving cash to the Contras "would allow them to buy 'good-will' with the local population, thereby strengthening the Contras' position in Nicaragua." When negoti-

ations halted at the end of June, the resistance took the blame. But no one pointed out that the Sandinistas would agree to general statements of democratic intent but consistently refused immediate, irreversible reforms or a timetable of specific actions by which they could be judged before the Contras were to be disarmed completely.

Thus the Democratic leadership's true agenda gradually has leaked out. The real reason for opposing Contra aid is not fear of another Vietnam or any of the other red herrings raised thus far. Rather, it has become a litmus test of a Democrat's anti-Reaganism. Politics uber alles.

The Democratic leadership has supported the Sandinista interpretation of every provision of the Sapo accord, no matter how glaringly self-interested and tortured. With the collapse of negotiations, Sandinista reversion of a more overt police state, renewal of scattered fighting in Nicaragua and the prospects of another House vote on this issue, it's begun to appear that the Democrats, whose convention floor was inundated with "stop Contra aid" signs, will indeed be the pallbearers for democracy in Central America.

A SALUTE TO ENRICO CARUSO: WORLD RENOWNED TENOR

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the illustrious career of Enrico Caruso. Enrico was born in Naples, Italy, in 1873 and made his debut in Morelli's L'Amico Francesco at the age of 22. Renowned as the greatest tenor of all time, he came to the United States in 1903 and remained at the Metropolitan Opera in New York until 1920.

Enrico Caruso's career will be celebrated in a concert by the Friends of the Opera of Michigan on September 15, 1988, in Dearborn. I join with the Friends of the Opera of Michigan and Mayor Michael Guido of the city of Dearborn in honoring this exceptionally talented individual. I am also proud to insert into the RECORD a proclamation issued by Mayor Guido proclaiming September 15, 1988, as Enrico Caruso Day in Dearborn, MI.

CITY OF DEARBORN—PROCLAMATION

Mayor Michael A. Guido

Whereas, the life and musical genius of Enrico Caruso, the most talented and renowned tenor in the history of mankind, will be celebrated in a concert by the Friends of the Opera of Michigan in Dearborn on Thursday, September 15, 1988; and,

Whereas, from the time of his debut in 1895 until his untimely death in 1921 at the age of 48, Enrico Caruso thrilled world audiences with his exceptional talent and superb technique; and,

Whereas, Enrico Caruso, the man and the legend, will be remembered forever for his outstanding recordings and his remarkable 636 performances during 18 spectacular seasons as premier performer for the Metropolitan Opera; and,

Whereas, the great Enrico Caruso remains a source of pride for all those of Italian her-

itage and all of those who love opera and respect performing genius; now,

Therefore, as Mayor of Dearborn, I proclaim "Enrico Caruso Day," September 15, 1988, in the Home Town of Henry Ford and urge all residents to support and applaud the Friends of the Opera of Michigan in this ambitious, worthwhile and noble effort to salute the incomparable Enrico Caruso.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND THE INTERNATIONAL DRUG WAR

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, as we attempt to transform the feeble fight we are now waging against narcotics into a real war against drugs, it becomes particularly important to consider various views and perspectives on this issue.

I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to one set of recommendations, written by Louis W. Goodman, dean, and Johanna S.R. Mendelson, director of Democracy Projects, at the School of International Service of the American University in Washington, DC, which was published on Friday, July 22, 1988 in the Christian Science Monitor.

In this article the authors address the international drug problem and the difficulty in developing an appropriate response. Goodman and Mendelson base their findings on a discussion of Latin civilian-military relations with more than 50 active-duty Latin American military officers and an equal number of scholars from North and South America.

I hope all my colleagues will take a moment to read this thought-provoking piece.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 22, 1988]

WHOSE DRUG WAR IS IT, ANYWAY?

(By Louis W. Goodman and Johanna S.R. Mendelson)

Ten years ago a number of Latin American military leaders—most of them heading governments with histories of human rights repression—returned presidential authority to civilians. In 1978, 14 countries between the Rio Grande and Tierra del Fuego were headed by military men; this year only two, Paraguay and Chile, continue to have military presidents.

Despite continuing military influence in many countries, this appearance of democracy has been welcomed enthusiastically by citizens throughout the hemisphere. Support of such democratic initiatives as open elections, constitutionalism, and attention to civil rights has become a keystone of United States foreign policy toward Latin America.

Yet if improved civilian-military relations are evident in countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Peru, and Uruguay, there is still reason to wonder whether civilian-led elected government is permanent or merely a phase in another cycle of democracy and dictatorship.

Last month, at the American University in Washington, D.C., more than 50 active-duty Latin American military officers, including the ministers of defense of Uruguay, Guatemala, and Honduras, joined an equal number of scholars from North and South

America to discuss Latin civilian-military relations.

The agenda focused on how improvement in such relations might strengthen democracy in the region. Officers and civilians openly talked of their views of the national security threats involved. They recognized that there are challenges to democracy that are equal to, if not greater than, the region's problems of indebtedness, civil war, and narcotics trafficking.

Much discussion centered on what was seen as a direct threat to sound civilian-military relations: involvement of the military as front-line combatants in the war on drugs. There was widespread agreement that such a new mission for Latin armies would undermine the region's fragile democracies.

The issue evoked deeply felt emotions. A Mexican officer at the meeting, who had been involved in antidrug campaigns, said:

"The war on drugs is not some abstract program. The victims of this war are my fellow officers, killed in action fighting civilian drug traffickers within our own borders. Narcotics consumed in our countries is stained with the blood of my friends."

Most arguments against such a policy were simple and direct:

- Battling narcotics traffickers would give Latin militaries a mission that is appropriate for a civilian state's police powers.

- Increased military intervention in civilian life contradicts the shared US and Latin policy of promoting civilian democratic government.

- Assigning such powers to the military would put new pressures for autonomy on an institution that is just learning to work constructively with civilian leaders.

If civilian democratic government is to become a permanent feature of Latin politics, US policymakers should heed such warnings. In Latin America the military has a near-monopoly on the means of physical coercion. Thus, offering US military assistance to fight the war on drugs, or approving aid only for countries whose militaries are involved in fighting the drug trade, can only tip the balance toward the return of military governments.

A multilateral approach to the war on drugs, led by civilian government leaders from throughout the hemisphere, is the best hope for combating the drug problem.

Would putting more arms in the hands of Latin armies actually stop the drug trade? Many in the US Senate doubt the effectiveness of giving more resources to the US military to fight the drug war. A recent General Accounting Office report to Congress stated that there is "no direct correlation between the resources spent to interdict and the long-term availability of imported drugs in the domestic market."

No one questions the need to deal with narcotics trafficking. Resorting to military solutions that bypass civilian control, however, can provide neither short-term relief nor long-term results. It would be ironic if, in pursuit of election-year toughness of drugs, US politicians were to adopt a simplistic policy that might prevent their Latin counterparts from staying in office.

The solution to curbing the drug trade lies not in new missions for Latin military forces but in multilateral efforts controlled by civilians.

SALUTE TO CARL HOLMAN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Carl Holman, president of the National Urban Coalition. As many of my colleagues are aware, Mr. Holman passed away yesterday.

During my years as a Member of this distinguished body, I came to know Carl to be a foremost advocate of efforts to address and solve urban problems. He dedicated his life to solving the problems of the poor and less fortunate in this country. Having been born in a small town in Mississippi, Carl never forgot his roots. Even when he was amongst Members of Congress or Presidents of the United States, he always kept his eyes on the prize—the prize being a better world for all.

Mr. Speaker, all too often we find ourselves paying tribute to persons once they have passed, rather than when they are alive and able to enjoy and reflect on such recognition. I am thankful this was not the case with Carl's own National Urban Coalition, which honored him in May of this year at its 21st Anniversary Convocation. On the day before Carl was honored by the National Urban Coalition, Washington Post columnist Courtland Milloy wrote a piece which, I believe, spoke well of Carl's contributions to this country.

At this time, I would like to submit for the RECORD Courtland Milloy's editorial, titled, "Homage to Carl Holman."

HOMAGE TO CARL HOLMAN

When the National Urban Coalition holds its 21st Anniversary Convocation here tomorrow, awards will be conferred on several people who have made outstanding contributions to the health, education and welfare of young people nationwide.

But it is the main man, M. Carl Holman, president of the National Urban Coalition, to whom I would like to pay homage, primarily because he has done so much yet asked for so little in return. A rare bird indeed.

In my looking back over more than two decades of news stories, M. Carl Holman's name is mentioned more than a thousand times—for speaking out on urban affairs issues and launching valiant efforts to solve urban problems.

Yet little has been said about the man himself. Born in June 1919 of humble parents in Minter City, Miss., Holman has become one of the outstanding intellectuals of our time.

A graduate of Lincoln University, University of Chicago and Yale, a poet, journalist, teacher and civil rights activist, he is living proof that education is the key to success. But he was not content with personal excellence. Knowing firsthand that a black child growing up in poverty could achieve if given the opportunity, Holman dedicated himself to helping others.

As president of the National Urban Coalition, he made great strides in developing creative solutions to urban problems, education being his pet.

The coalition's new "Say Yes to a Youngster's Future" campaign, which emphasizes Holman's longstanding concern for math and science enhancement among blacks and

women, has the potential for being the most successful educational program of its kind to come along in years.

Last year's coalition program included numerous testimonials about Holman that bear repeating to a wider audience.

"Carl Holman's passionate commitment to improving the quality of life for our country's poor continues to earn him the respect and admiration of the nation," wrote Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children's Defense Fund. "On countless occasions, his determination and perseverance have encouraged us to not give up."

"Holman is one of the real heroes of the continuing struggle to create the 'holy dream' we were meant to be," wrote scholar Lerone Bennett Jr. "Twenty years ago, when the cities were burning and the forces of urban renovation were in disarray, he organized a coalition of hope and articulated an advanced program of urban reconstruction. And if we are saved, we will be saved by men and women, black and white, who share his passion and hope."

"Your singular ability to bring individuals and groups together to forge coalitions for social justice has made you the indispensable agent for social change," wrote Hyman Bookbinder, special representative for the American Jewish Committee. "I am especially grateful to you for limiting the damage in black-Jewish relations in the last decade and restoring the historic bond between our two communities. Right on, dear friend."

It is amazing that Holman never turned into a limelight grabber. As a coalition builder, he seemed to possess and uncanny ability to turn himself into a kind of invisible glue that holds people together.

"He doesn't believe in confrontations but in creating an ambience that says let's reason together," said Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz, former chairman of the coalition. "He has a knack for hearing what is not being said."

Said Eleanor Holmes Norton, a professor of law at Georgetown University: "He is one of the leaders whose impact has been enormous but whose style has not projected the magnitude of that impact."

In an interview for the coalition's magazine last year, Holman commented on his style.

"I guess when you compare me to my colleagues, I certainly am low-key," he said. "But when you work in a coalition, you sometimes get a lot more done if it doesn't seem to people that you're trying to push out front and take credit."

But there is no doubt about it: The credit is due.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSION TESTIMONY

HON. FREDERICK S. UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress created a National Economic Commission, charged with making recommendations to Congress and to the next President over the best means to reduce the Federal budget deficit while promoting economic growth.

There is a great deal of debate over which policies will help achieve these goals, and which policies will take us even further away

from a responsible Federal budget and a growing economy. There are many ideas which are being considered, and speculation abounds over what proposals the Commission will recommend.

The Commission has invited all Members of Congress and other interested parties to submit testimony on how best to achieve deficit reduction alongside economic growth. I accepted the Commission's invitation to make such recommendations, and I would like to share these comments with my colleagues, by having my testimony printed in the RECORD.

The text of the testimony follows:

**U.S. CONGRESSMAN FRED UPTON—COMBINING
EQUITABLE DEFICIT REDUCTION WITH ECONOMIC
GROWTH: WRITTEN COMMENTS TO
THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSION**

The National Economic Commission (NEC) faces a difficult challenge. Congress directed it to make recommendations on methods to (1) reduce the federal budget deficit while, (2) promoting economic growth and encouraging saving and capital formation and, (3) ensuring that the burden of achieving the deficit reduction goal is equitably distributed. These three goals of deficit reduction, economic growth, and equity are, though not necessarily contradictory, difficult to meet together. Congress included an additional NEC mandate in the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1989. That document orders the NEC to study the budgetary and economic impacts of trust funds, such as the Social Security Trust Fund and self-supporting public enterprise funds like the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Some are also asking the NEC to suggest procedural changes. The NEC should review the budget process, for it cries out for reform. However, that should not be its primary focus. Budget procedures have long been debated in Congress, and this would be going over old territory one more time. These procedures, however inadequate, are not at the heart of the deficit problem.

The heart of the problem is poor coordination of the three major federal functions—spending, taxing, and regulation. The NEC should make coordinating these functions its primary focus. Deficit reduction, economic growth, and equity can be met by a better coordination of those policies. The Commission should also focus its study of "trust"—or more precisely dedicated revenue—funds on the advance of these goals.

NEEDED CHANGES IN THE FEDERAL PROCESS

The President and many Members of Congress advocate budget process changes to help deficit reduction efforts. For example, President Reagan in his State of the Union address complained about the huge FY88 continuing resolution (CR) that landed on his desk in late December 1987. He rightly vowed to veto such CRs in the future. Congress should not pass huge continuing resolutions which fund large portions of the federal government. We should outlaw multi-appropriations continuing resolutions; if we cannot do so, we should give the President line-veto power for CRs.

The President has repeatedly asked for a balanced-budget constitutional amendment and a general line-item veto power. He has also requested that Congress alter budget procedures to place its initial budget blueprint as a joint resolution, requiring his signature, instead of passing it as a concurrent resolution.

All these measures should be adopted. The balanced budget amendment should

allow some flexibility to deficit spend during times of war or economic emergency, as most balanced budget amendment proposals suggest. The line-item veto is operative in 43 state governments, and should be adopted by the federal government. Enacting budget resolutions in the form of joint resolutions would make the executive branch an earlier and more effective participant in budgetary deliberations, reducing the chance of stalemate later in the process.

Two additional procedural reforms would be helpful. First, budget consideration would be simplified if budget proposals were based on one set of economic assumptions, shared by the Executive and Legislative branches and changed only by mutual consent of the two branches. This could be accomplished by reconciling differences between the president estimates of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congressional Budget Office.

Second, the President's budget proposal should not be submitted in current services form. A current services budget institutes a bias toward ever-increasing spending. Some programs may deserve inflation increases or more, but Congress should not start with a presumption of more spending on every program.

These processes changes would improve the way budget decisions are made. However, procedural reforms by themselves are not enough. Focusing only on procedure avoids the tough choices which the NEC, and the Congress and the next President, must face, Deficit Reduction.

The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit targets can be met in a responsible manner. These targets should be considered minimum amounts—courageous action by Congress could move us more quickly toward a balanced budget and continued economic growth.

The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets can be reached without raising taxes. The budget can be balanced by careful spending reductions, increased user fees, and divestment of some federal functions which can be better performed elsewhere. Raising any significant amount of new taxes beyond current policy risks far greater economic harm than any potential benefits.

The NEC should recommend starting with a freeze on spending. A one-year freeze would save \$12 billion, even with inflation adjustments for Social Security and other retirees. A two-year discretionary spending freeze would save \$30 billion. This freeze should be the cornerstone of deficit cutting efforts.

Congress and the President could save money by ending and simplifying federally-mandated programs which local governments must enforce. This can be done with more block grant programs and fewer specific mandates. The federal government should not use block grants to end help for local entities complying with federally-mandated programs; instead, Washington should limit these mandates as much as it can. Block grants enhance local judgment in meeting local needs, while reducing federal outlays.

Federalism as the guiding principle of intergovernmental relations needs to be revived. Not all problems are best solved by a federal program controlled from a Washington, D.C. office. The federal government can provide leadership on issues without providing the entire amount of funds to "fix" the problem. The Commission should list which present federal government functions are not federal responsibilities, and

which can be transferred to state and/or local governments.

The national government has few revenue sources unavailable to state and local governments. Those citizens of Michigan who pay federal taxes also pay state and local taxes. If a particular city or state wants to spend more on a local problem, that city or state should look to itself first to provide funds.

Management, contracting, and procurement improvements can also reduce outlays. Reforming Davis-Bacon laws would take billions of dollars off the federal deficit. Contracting out activities to the private sector would provide immediate and long-term budget savings. Improving debt collection practices would emphasize the responsibility recipients have to pay back government loans, while significantly reducing federal deficits. Loan portfolio sales could enhance revenues, provided such offers are carefully made to maximize federal receipts. Careful sales of unneeded government property would increase federal revenues notably. One single idea, closing obsolete military bases, would save from \$2 to \$5 billion annually.

Finally, Congress and the President must resist the temptation to "solve" continuing social problems with new and expensive government programs. For example, expanding health insurance coverage is a positive goal. But a new bureaucracy controlling a national health plan funded by federal tax dollars is not needed. Private sector solutions should be fully explored before resorting to new and expensive government programs. We should encourage and enable private health insurance coverage with tax credits, earmarked tax-deferred savings accounts, and incentives for private insurers to develop appropriate policies.

PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH

The federal government can promote economic growth by ensuring that federal regulatory policies encourage economic activity and federal tax policies promote capital formation and productive investment. Both of these areas have a direct impact on the federal deficit. Excessive and confusing regulation deadens economic activity and results in lower productivity and fewer jobs. This means less tax income from businesses and individuals, and increased federal spending on countercyclical programs such as unemployment compensation. Tax policy which discourages savings and productive investment shrinks the amount of funds available for investment, and raises interest rates for the funds which are available.

There is a great deal of truth in the old adage "if you want less of something, tax it." Recent government regulation has drastically increased the "taxes" imposed on America's economy. Increased federal mandates and regulations make it more expensive to run businesses and employ workers. Current federal mandates in the labor area alone cost an estimated \$200 billion a year.

Some mandates advance justifiable social goals, but a growth-conscious government should be very careful about creating new mandates. Unfortunately, there is legislation pending to, among other things, increase the minimum wage, expand OSHA work place "risk notification" powers, and require paternal leave and health insurance. The NEC should point out the negative budgetary consequences of increased federal mandates, and suggest more efficient ways to accomplish desired goals.

No federal tax program is policy-neutral, and the present tax code is no exception. A pro-growth federal tax policy should reward savings, discourage consumption, encourage personal economic responsibility, and promote investment in productive and socially beneficial goals.

One interesting idea is creating Personal Security Accounts (PSAs) and Personal Security Bonds (PSBs). PSAs would be modeled after Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs). Individuals could accumulate tax-free savings in PSAs, to be used only for purposes which enhance their economic security and well-being. Approved uses could be saving for retirement, buying health insurance or care for oneself or a family member, paying for job training/retraining or education programs, or buying one's first home.

A PSB program would work much like the proposed "college saving bond" program works to promote savings for college costs, but with expanded uses for things which make one more personally secure and less dependent upon direct government handouts.

Major advantages of PSAs/PSBs are that they would encourage savings for socially desirable goals and they would efficiently meet policy objectives. Increasing domestic savings would reduce our dependence on foreign capital to finance government debt and industrial innovation. Efficient delivery of social services would reduce the total net cost to society of these programs.

The tax code should encourage industrial productivity, the "reforms" of 1981, 1982, 1984, and 1986 eliminated or phased out many incentives to save and invest in capital and research. A low capital gains tax rate, the research and development tax credit, and the investment tax credit all promote economic growth. The NEC should examine the effects of recent changes in these provisions, and recommend reinstatement where appropriate.

Finally, some tax-favored practices should be eliminated in the name of simplification and consistency. The NEC, however, should recommend full retention of the home mortgage interest and charitable contribution deductions. Home equity is an important asset which is a key part of the financial security for many people, especially retirees. Charitable organizations meet many social needs, which might otherwise have to be addressed by new or expanded federal bureaucracies.

Federal tax and regulatory policies need simplification as well. Businesses spend countless hours trying to comply with new federal regulations, and attempting to interpret ever-changing tax law and IRS rulings. This time could better be spent on economically productive activities. Industry would more easily meet environmental, safety, and other regulatory goals if they could do so in a common sense manner. If tax compliance were easier, industry would object less strongly to federal tax rates. The Commission should recommend how regulatory and revenue goals could be met more simply to increase productivity and growth.

Simple and coordinated tax and regulatory policies will have positive effects on the federal deficit. Increased economic activity will reduce federal outlays for countercyclical social programs. Economic growth will increase federal tax receipts. Increased savings will reduce interest rates, encouraging economic growth and lowering government debt financing costs. These policies will not entirely enable the U.S. to "grow out" of

the deficit, but they will make a positive contribution.

SHARE RESPONSIBILITY FAIRLY

The NEC is also required to make recommendations equitable. Any "pain" involved in deficit reduction must not be borne unfairly by one economic group, social group, region or state.

The relationship between the government and the individual should be one of mutual obligation and respect. In recognizing the value of each person, the government has an obligation to protect those groups of persons who are unable to protect themselves—the poor, the young, the elderly, and the disabled. But most individuals in most age groups have the means to provide for themselves. As a mark of respect for themselves, others, and the limits of government, these persons have an obligation to provide for themselves. The policy goal is to protect those who cannot provide for themselves, while challenging those who can.

The federal government should continue to protect disabled individuals such as the blind and otherwise handicapped, even as many programs in this area could be run more efficiently.

Retired persons also deserve special consideration. Most of the elderly live on fixed incomes, and cannot easily increase income or reduce their cost of living. Inflation is their major fear, and anti-inflation policies are their best protection. The poor elderly need protection from escalating costs such as health care, over which they have no control and cannot afford to pay.

Children, our most precious investment, also deserve special consideration. Programs like Head Start and Chapter 1 education programs need to be supported and expanded. Pre-natal and early childhood nutrition programs also need adequate funding.

Able-bodied persons, however, need to develop personal and financial resources to care for themselves and not depend on government. Income assistance programs should contain strong and rigorous work requirements. Housing assistance programs should encourage participation by recipients in the management of housing facilities. Recipients of educational assistance should have to meet class attendance requirements. Vocational and job-training beneficiaries should have to meet job search goals.

Means-testing of some middle-class federal programs should be considered. Federal aid is not a right to which everyone is entitled. The purpose of federal aid is to help persons meet needs such as health care, education, and housing if they cannot meet those needs themselves. Too many federal programs simply recycle the same dollars, taking from the citizen as taxpayer, and giving back to that citizen as aid recipient. In this cycle, tax dollars are lost on administrative expenses, waste and fraud.

BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF TRUST FUNDS

The final Commission mandate is to study the budgetary and economic impacts of "trust funds" such as Social Security, and dedicated revenue funds such as the Highway Trust Fund.

Congress and the Executive Branch are engaged in a silent conspiracy to use trust fund surpluses to reduce the overall federal deficit. The major reason that some persons advocate Social Security COLA freezes is to increase the already large surpluses in the Social Security Trust Fund.

Funds in the Social Security Trust Fund should be divided into two accounts. The first account would contain the funds neces-

sary to pay Social Security benefits for a fixed period of time—a "short-term needs" fund. The second account would contain funds needed to meet anticipated expenditures several years later—a "long-term savings" fund.

The short-term needs fund could remain on budget, while the long-term savings portion should be put off-budget immediately. Establishing two categories of funds, and putting the long-term fund off-budget, would reduce the temptation to cut Social Security expenditures to fund other parts of the budget.

The Highway Trust Fund and the Airport and Airway Trust Fund have large surpluses, which are also held back to reduce the deficit. For these "infrastructure" funds, a mechanism should be established to ensure that these dedicated revenues are spent as intended. Appropriate ceilings for each fund could be set, after which the dedicated revenue source (excise taxes, ticket charges, etc.) would be reduced.

SUMMARY

The task of the NEC is challenging, but also very important. The Commission can lend credibility to efforts to reduce the federal budget deficit by calling for cuts in spending, by suggesting tax policies which emphasize savings and investment for economic and social goals, by proposing equitable means to meet these goals, and by solving the dilemma of "trust fund" budget accounting. I hope that my suggestions help in that task.

CRISIS MANAGEMENT DEMANDS THE BEST

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, when a major disaster occurs, we rightly praise those who are on the scene immediately—fire, police, health and rescue workers. It's easy, however, to overlook those heroes and heroines who work behind the scenes. Frequently they are the ones who help minimize the impact of the disaster and, equally important, help the victims rebuild their lives.

In the predawn hours of July 8, 1986, in a quiet community in the Fourth Congressional District I represent, a residential street suddenly exploded in flames. Thousands of gallons of gasoline leaking from an underground pipeline caught fire. A young mother and daughter were immediately killed in the holocaust. Another woman was seriously injured.

An unsung hero in that terrible tragedy was Mounds View clerk-administrator, Don Pauley. He was on the scene immediately working with police and fire officials. And in the weeks and months after the disaster, he continued the important work of helping families impacted by the accident and the entire community cope.

I know from my personal experience of working closely with Don Pauley that he has been a tireless advocate of improved pipeline safety. After I introduced legislation to toughen existing Federal pipeline safety laws and expand pipeline inspections, Don joined me in testifying at congressional hearings. He also

worked diligently with local officials for strong safety laws at the State level.

Don Pauley's work and professionalism have been recognized by University of Minnesota professor, George Realmuto, an expert on stress and crisis response. Dr. Realmuto is going to use Don Pauley's management style as a model at a national seminar on crisis management.

I would like to share with my colleagues this article by Lisa Legge which appeared in the Roseville-Mounds View Focus. Hopefully this information will assist other community officials who must deal with crisis management problems.

[From the Roseville-Mounds View Focus,
Aug. 3, 1988]

CLERK-ADMINISTRATOR LED RESPONSE TO
DISASTER

(By Lisa Legge)

Don Pauley acted on "instinct" when he responded to an emergency call early the morning of July 8, 1986.

Until that evening, the Mounds View civil defense director coordinated emergency efforts, dealt with Williams Pipe Line staff and made decisions affecting his neighbors and his city.

Pauley's instincts must have been good. So good that when Dr. George Realmuto, a professor of psychiatry at the University of Minnesota, presents his research to the Society of Post-Traumatic Stress this October in Dallas, he will use Pauley's management style as a model for handling crises.

"I thought it was unique because mostly what people consider important (after disasters) are property destruction, personal injury, necessities like food, shelter and clothing, transportation and communication, all of which are vital and necessary," Realmuto said.

"However, what could have long-term effects is the way people adapt to that significant stress," Realmuto said.

"Just because the streets are repaved and new houses are built or the trees are cut down and new trees are planted, doesn't mean people don't drive down that street and still visualize what they saw that morning," Pauley said last week.

"I knew that they needed something," he said, "because those who weren't injured went through a lot of hell that day."

Pauley pointed to a poster-sized photograph on a wall in his City Hall office that shows flames leaping above treetops lining Long Lake Road.

"And I'm using 'hell' in the biblical sense, because it was like the biblical description of what hell is supposed to be: fire and brimstone," he said.

Pauley, who lives with his family near the area where the explosion occurred, listened to his neighbors' concerns, saw to it their physical needs were met and set up counseling sessions for anyone who suffered through the ordeal and wanted help. In addition, he coordinated emergency and relief services, which might otherwise have splintered or overlapped.

"We know from other disasters that's not a good way," Realmuto said. "If there's no central coordinating body, usually it causes much more grief and agony and difficulty for people."

Pauley coordinated an ad-hoc communication system that kept residents informed of any new developments concerning their neighborhood. The city published a newsletter for residents of the area when developments occurred.

Pauley conducted private meetings to discuss residents' concerns about other dangers, pollution resulting from the incident settlements with the pipeline company and the city's lawsuit, filed just days after the explosion.

"Not having information is another source of poor management," Realmuto said, further praising Pauley's efforts at keeping the victims up-to-date.

"The media didn't have access to the people except through Don Pauley, which I think kept people's private misery private," he said.

"He also took an active role in protecting the community as far as dealing directly with Williams Pipe Line Co.," the professor said.

Pauley went toe-to-toe with a Williams crew that attempted to replace the damaged section of pipeline days after the incident. He threatened to have the men arrested if they went ahead with their plan without city authority. The crew got back on its truck and left.

Pauley also put Realmuto in touch with Mounds View residents so researchers could learn more about their stress symptoms and so residents could get help.

Due largely to the Mounds View explosion, the Minnesota Legislature last year passed the Minnesota Pipeline Safety Act, establishing the Office of Pipeline Safety to regulate pipeline operators.

"He was one of the driving forces, part of the team that got the thing going," said Rep. Dan Knuth, DFL-New Brighton, a sponsor of the bill, explaining that Pauley testified before at least six congressional committees and the pipeline commission.

"He did an outstanding job during the emergency and then laid the groundwork for the rest of us to get the legislation through," Knuth said.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE
DISPLAY OF THE NATIONAL
LEAGUE OF FAMILIES POW/
MIA FLAG AT U.S. DIPLOMATIC
OR CONSULAR POSTS

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to require each U.S. diplomatic or consular post to fly the National League of Families POW/MIA flag until a sufficient accounting of our missing men in Indochina is made. Our country is still suffering from the scars of Vietnam. However, for most this suffering is a memory that we tend to forget about when going about our busy lives. The stark memories of Vietnam are brought back to us at certain times, such as, a visit to the popular Vietnam memorial in Washington, DC, or by movies and television shows depicting the Vietnam war. However, for one group of Americans the suffering and pain of Vietnam is not just a faded memory. It is a daily pain that they must endure because their father, son, husband, or brother is missing and unaccounted for in Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos. Over 2,000 Americans are still listed as missing in action. These families live with a constant stream of questions about the location and welfare of their loved ones.

To its credit, the administration has taken a fairly active position on the POW/MIA issue. During the dedication for the Unknown Soldier from the Vietnam War, President Reagan declared "an end to America's involvement in Vietnam cannot come to an end before we've achieved the fullest accounting of those missing in action" and again rededicated this task as a "highest national priority." Since 1982 the administration has held level negotiations with the Governments of Vietnam and Laos. As a result of these talks, remains of some Americans the Vietnamese listed as "died in captivity" in South Vietnam have been returned. These are the first remains to be returned since the end of the war. Continued efforts are needed until all of the soldiers are accounted for.

I introduced this measure to provide a symbol to the world that we have not forgotten those brave individuals who sacrificed for our country. The flying of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag over Federal buildings is not unprecedented. In fact on POW/MIA Recognition Day, it flies over the U.S. Capitol, the White House, the Departments of State and Defense, and the Veterans' Administration. Military bases are also encouraged to fly the National League of Families POW/MIA flag on appropriate days.

Strong bipartisan support for continued pursuit of the POW/MIA issue has been formed in Congress. To this end, Congress has passed legislation directing the President to secure a full accounting of Americans missing in Southeast Asia. In addition, in order to keep the issue of POW/MIA's current in the minds of the administration and the American people, Congress has passed legislation designating POW/MIA Recognition Week. I believe that this legislation, which I am introducing today, will add to the past congressional efforts.

While such measures can do little to relieve the pain for American families that have suffered the loss of a loved one, I believe they represent an appropriate expression of our unending commitment to answering the MIA question. I urge my colleagues to join me on this measure which will provide a constant international reminder that there are still Americans unaccounted for in Indochina and that our commitment to them remains.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DISPLAY OF POW/MIA FLAG AT EACH
UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC AND
CONSULAR POST.

The National League of Families POW/MIA flag shall be displayed at each United States diplomatic or consular post until the President determines that there has been the fullest possible accounting of the Americans who are imprisoned, missing, or unaccounted for as a result of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

SECTION 2. MANNER OF DISPLAY.

The National League of Families POW/MIA flag displayed pursuant to section 1 shall be displayed in such size and place as the Secretary of State may determine consistent with section 3 of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs per-

taining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America" (36 U.S.C. 175).

ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

HON. JACK BUECHNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, to drill or not to drill? That is the question of serious consequence to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge [ANWR] that many of my colleagues and I have been struggling with for some time now. After much debate and careful consideration, I am here today to express my support and cosponsorship of H.R. 39, which would designate the ANWR Coastal Plain as wilderness.

In 1960 we recognized the unsurpassed wildlife and wilderness values of this area's pristine ecosystems by establishing the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Today we must address this basic question: Has the value of this area changed in the past 28 years so that we can no longer appreciate the great treasures of wildlife, or is it that our standards have changed, so that we place the prospect of petroleum resources above an undeveloped landscape with 450 unique species?

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, together with the adjacent Yukon National Park in Canada, comprise one of the most extensive and diverse undeveloped landscapes in North America. In particular, these reserves are home for the 160,000-head Porcupine caribou herd. Petroleum development on the herd's calving ground could jeopardize the continued existence of one of the two great caribou herds in the United States and this Nation's only significant international herd. Many other important species of wildlife that make their home in the coastal plain of the refuge could also be adversely affected.

I appreciate and understand oil producers' argument that the potential economic benefits from drilling along the coastal plain will be substantial. But I think we all realize that these diverse species are important economically and environmentally. They are vital to the subsistence economy and traditions of the Eskimos and Indians that live in and near the refuge.

Moreover, the Fish and Wildlife Service recently reported that present oil development in northern Alaska has caused more environmental damage than the Government predicted. The report's findings are that 11,000 acres of vegetation used by the wildlife at Prudhoe Bay have been lost, almost double what was predicted, and that most bird species in the area have declined in population, as have bears, wolves, and other predators. Defenders of drilling have often compared the environmental impact in the ANWR to that of Prudhoe Bay—the consequences of which seem to be much more serious than expected. This report shows that the environmental impact is much more extensive than we thought and underscores the need to maintain the wilderness.

I have chosen to cosponsor H.R. 39 because I believe that the dollar should not be

the ultimate determination for such important decisions for this Nation as to whether we protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and cause us to sacrifice great principle and common sense. To drill in this part of Alaska would be shortsighted and irreversible.

As Justice William Douglas said, "The Arctic has a call that is compelling. The call is that of a wilderness known only to a few * * *. This last American wilderness must remain sacrosanct."

Nowhere else in North America is the unique scenic wilderness, wildlife and ecological values. Signs of modern man are few, providing opportunities for true wilderness experiences. Entire plant and animal communities are left undisturbed to carry out their natural life cycles. Each living thing in the Arctic has a precarious existence. While allowing ongoing human activities to continue, the ANWR provides an area where natural processes can respond to natural forces. Sustaining the variety, richness, and wilderness of the Arctic can only benefit present and future generations.

I urge my colleagues to join me in preserving the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and its incomparable natural resource contribution.

PROGRESS IN CHEMICAL ARMS CONTROL IN GENEVA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there have been some very positive developments in Geneva in the area of a chemical arms control that deserve highlighting and commendation. Work on all aspects of a comprehensive and verifiable ban on chemical weapons has progressed well at the multilateral negotiations in Geneva. It appears to be a sign of our confidence and interest in moving these negotiations forward that our ambassador to the talks, Ambassador Max L. Friedersdorf, announced on July 28, 1988, that the United States was identifying its current chemical weapons production facilities as an initiative of openness to prompt other nations which have chemical weapons to release similar information. At the same time, Ambassador Friedersdorf also announced the very positive development of increased cooperation between civil chemical industry and the multilateral conference.

The cooperation between international chemical manufacturers and the negotiators is an important development because it represents a commitment by the chemical industry to an international treaty banning chemical weapons which can ultimately make that treaty effective, comprehensive, and verifiable. The United States has now agreed to a Soviet proposal for a multilateral effort to develop and test procedures for conducting inspections of chemical industry facilities. The first step in that process has already been taken and that involved the U.S. Government working with American chemical manufacturers to develop and test inspection procedures.

These developments are encouraging and seem to indicate that these multilateral negoti-

ations in Geneva now have a strong independent momentum of their own which has not been too disturbed by the controversy here over whether or not the United States should embark on a new binary chemical weapons production program. The substantial progress already achieved in Geneva and the positive prospects for a treaty conclusion in 1989 indicate even more convincingly the inadvisability of our country embarking on an expensive new binary chemical weapons program which carries with it many disruptive foreign policy consequences since our NATO allies will not accept the weapons in Europe and many technical problems continue to plague the program since the Bigeye bomb has still not proven itself ready for production much less deployment. If the new weapons we hope to produce in this program don't work and can't be deployed where they are needed we shouldn't waste money on such a program. If, on the other hand, we can secure that arena of chemical weapons confrontation in Europe and elsewhere by achieving an effective and verifiable arms control agreement then that is a much wiser course.

U.S. production facilities that would be subject to destruction are located at Rocky Mountain Arsenal, CO (sarin production); Newport Army Ammunition Plant, Newport, IN (VX production); Pine Bluff Arsenal, Pine Bluff, AR (difluoro and QL production); Muscle Shoals, AL (dichloro production); and Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD (pilot plant).

I am including here the remarks by Ambassador Friedersdorf in Geneva on July 28, 1988, which describe these positive developments in the negotiations:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. President: As this is the first opportunity that I have had to make a prepared statement this month, permit me to begin by congratulating you and the delegation of India for your outstanding stewardship of the conference during the month of July.

Our delegation also extends its best wishes to those other representatives who are leaving us or have recently departed: Ambassador Ahmad of Pakistan, who worked so long and patiently here in Geneva and during the third special session of the U.N. General Assembly devoted to disarmament; Ambassador Tellalov of Bulgaria; Ambassador U Tin Tun of Burma; Ambassador Meiszter of Hungary, who did such a fine job as our President in April; and Ambassador Tarmidzi of Indonesia, and we welcome and pledge our cooperation to those new representatives to this body. Ambassador Kostov of Bulgaria, Ambassador Loeis of Indonesia, Ambassador Ruoro of Kenya, and Ambassador De Rivero of Peru.

Mr. President, I would like to begin today by introducing document number CD/839, which contains the tests of a statement by President Reagan, and of a statement by the assistant to the President for press relations, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the opening for signature of the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. These two statements attest to the great importance the United States attaches to strengthening international peace and stability through the prevention of any further spread of nuclear weapons. As President Reagan notes in his statement, "The

Non-Proliferation Treaty is one of the international community's most vital instruments" for doing just this.

The United States has been making concerted efforts to reduce the risk of nuclear war, and to meet the objectives of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, in particular under article VI, through its negotiation of the INF Treaty, now successfully concluded, and on a 50-percent reduction in the strategic arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States calls on all other nations to do their part, by adhering to the NPT Treaty if they have not yet done so, and, if they are already parties, by rededication to achieving the objectives of the treaty.

I also want to introduce, in parallel with the delegation of the Soviet Union, two additional documents important for our work here in this conference. The first is the joint statement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, issued following the summit meeting of President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Moscow May 29-June 1, 1988, which has been issued as document CD/846. This joint statement deals at length with arms control issues, including the nuclear and space talks, and chemical weapons issues, about which I shall have more to say shortly. The statement also records the exchange of instruments of ratification of the INF Treaty, an event of great historical significance for all of us, as it marks the first time that real nuclear disarmament, involving the elimination of an entire class of United States and Soviet nuclear arms, is taking place. The far-reaching inspection provisions of that treaty are now being implemented.

The second document, CD/847, is the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on notifications of launches of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, signed at Moscow on June 1, 1988. This agreement is the latest step taken by the two Governments designed to reduce the risk of initiation of nuclear war by miscalculation, misinterpretation, or accident. I hope to have more to say at a later point this summer about a number of the arms control issues addressed in the joint statement, and about the launch notification agreement.

Mr. President, at the close of the spring part of the CD session, I devoted two plenary statements to the status of the chemical weapons negotiations. On April 14, I commented on what had been achieved so far during the 1988 session. My statement on April 19 looked ahead to the summer part of this year's session.

Today I would like to return to the important subject of the prohibition of chemical weapons. A lot has happened since I last addressed the conference on this subject.

On several occasions during the last few months, a ban on chemical weapons has been addressed at a high level bilaterally by the United States and the Soviet Union. As I have already noted, the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union have held important and wide-ranging discussions of arms control issues, including the prohibition of chemical weapons. Furthermore, several meetings have been held at the ministerial level.

At the Moscow summit President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev reaffirmed the importance of efforts to address, as a matter of continuing urgency, the unique challenges of a chemical weapons ban and to achieve an effective convention.

They noted the progress already achieved in the talks, as well as the difficult problems remaining with regard to effective monitoring of the global prohibition of chemical weapons and the non-use of dual-capable chemicals for chemical weapons purposes. Furthermore, the leaders underlined problems of ensuring effective verification and undiminished security for all convention participants.

Both sides also agreed on the vital importance of greater openness by all states as a way to build confidence and strengthen the foundation for an effective convention. The leaders also emphasized the necessity of close coordination on a multilateral basis in order to ensure the participation of all CW-possessing and CW-capable states in the convention.

I believe this is the prevailing view in the international community as well. On the multilateral level, a text expressing the continuing urgency of prohibition of chemical weapons achieved broad support during SSOD-III, including the support of the United States delegation.

Mr. President, all these positions are reflected in the instructions to our delegation. If this commitment is reflected in the instructions to other delegations as well, then I believe that the prospects for further progress are good.

Let me now turn to the substance of the negotiations. Today I intend to address three key issues referred to in the United States-Soviet joint statement:

The vital importance of greater openness; The difficult problem of effective monitoring of the chemical industry; and

Ensuring participation in the convention of all CW-possessing and CW-capable states.

Increasingly, participants in the negotiations have recognized the vital importance of greater openness by all states about their chemical weapons capabilities and their chemical industries. The United States delegation itself has made major contributions in this regard. For example, in CD/711, presented in July 1986, the United States provided detailed information on its chemical weapons stockpile, including storage locations. Furthermore, in document CD/830, tabled last April, we presented further detailed information on the chemical weapons themselves.

Today the United States delegation is taking another major step toward greater openness. We are declaring the location of each of our chemical weapons production facilities. A map showing the locations is contained in the working paper being introduced today, which is entitled "Destruction of Chemical Weapons Production Facilities." It is our hope that this paper will contribute both to greater confidence and to the negotiation of related provisions of the convention.

The declaration we are making today is unprecedented. No other member of the conference has provided information on its chemical weapons production facilities. We urge other countries that possess chemical weapons production facilities to declare the locations of their facilities and to outline how the facilities would be destroyed.

Mr. President, in recent months the conference has made significant progress in resolving long-standing issues related to chemical weapons production facilities. An agreed definition is within reach. It has been agreed that all such facilities must be destroyed. Corresponding changes are already being made in the draft text of the future convention.

While there is agreement that chemical weapons production facilities must be destroyed, little information is available to the conference on how this would be done. This issue has already arisen in working group B this summer. To assist the negotiations, our working paper describes in general terms how the United States would go about the task of destroying its production facilities.

Openness, of course, has not been a monopoly of a few delegations. We are encouraged that the concept of multilateral data exchange has taken firm hold over the last year or two. Many delegations have provided relevant information in plenary statements or working papers. Undoubtedly, additional information will be forthcoming in the remaining weeks of this session.

Our records show that approximately a dozen members of the conference have not yet indicated whether or not they possess chemical weapons. We urge them to do so this summer.

Before leaving the subject of openness, I want to sound a quiet note of caution. Information presented to the conference can only facilitate the negotiations if it is accurate. On the other hand, inaccurate declarations will decrease confidence and complicate efforts to ban chemical weapons. Unfortunately, we believe statements regarding nonpossession of chemical weapons have already been made that are likely to have such an effect. Serious as the effects might be even now, the result of inaccurate declarations after entry into force might well be a series of challenge inspections, with the attendant political consequences. Truthful declarations are essential to the entire process of banning chemical weapons.

Mr. President, the conference has been wrestling with the difficult problem of effective monitoring of the chemical industry for some time. The report of the ad hoc committee on chemical weapons at the end of April, document CD/831, clearly shows that substantial progress has been made. The report, however, also makes clear that complicated and thorny issues remain. Resolving these issues will require not only creative approaches, but also a thorough understanding of conditions in the civil chemical industry.

Our delegation believes that representatives of the chemical industry can make an important contribution to the negotiations. This conviction has grown out of the close and longstanding contacts between our negotiators and policymakers on the one hand, and representatives of the American chemical industry on the other. We have found that industry shares our objective of a comprehensive, effectively verifiable, and truly global ban on chemical weapons. Permit me to cite a recent official statement made by Mr. Robert Roland, president of the American Chemical Manufacturers Association. This industry organization, which is called CMA for short, represents companies comprising more than 95 percent of the United States chemical production capacity.

In his statement on April 28, 1988, Mr. Roland called for a "strong, effective international treaty" to ban chemical weapons. He said American Canadian, Japanese and European chemical industry representatives have been working for several months on a set of recommendations that the CMA believes can facilitate agreement on a chemical weapons ban. When the recommendations are agreed to Mr. Roland said, "They will be sent to our negotiations along with our industries' pledge to do whatever we can to make such a treaty effective."

I also want to point out that the CMA's board of directors recently declared its strong support for a chemical weapons treaty and urged that the chemical industries of all nations work toward consensus on the technical issues.

Our conviction that industry is eager to facilitate the negotiations was reinforced by the informal discussions with industry representatives that were held last week here in Geneva. We are encouraged by the serious and constructive exchanges between negotiators and experts from industry. These exchanges made clear the need to devote greater attention to provisions for protection of confidential business information. They also highlighted the need to specify clearly what types of information should be considered confidential. We express our thanks to the industry representatives who came to Geneva and to those who organized the discussions. Their technical expertise and practical experience are of great value in resolving the many commonly recognized issues taken up in the discussions.

Another positive development is the proposal for a multilateral effort to develop and test procedures for conducting inspections of chemical industry facilities. Initially, my delegation reserved its position on that proposal until it was more fully developed. In light of refinements provided by the Soviet delegation, the United States endorses the concept of such a multilateral experiment and is willing to participate.

For the experiment to be successful, broad participation by states possessing commercial facilities that would be subject to routine inspection under the convention is essential.

Participation by others is also highly desirable. In our view, it is important for participants in the negotiations to declare not only whether or not they have chemical weapons, but also to declare soon whether or not they have civil chemical facilities that would be inspected. The United States, of course, does have such facilities.

We agree with the suggestion, made on April 26, that the experiment should proceed in a multistep fashion. Before procedures can be developed and tested internationally, individual states need to conduct their own national experiments and provide the results to the CD. The United States Government is already working with the chemical manufacturers association to develop and test inspection procedures. We urge the Soviet Union and others to indicate what actions they are taking.

Much discussion and planning must take place in the CD to make the experiment a reality. The concept is a good one, but it needs to be fleshed out. Many questions remain to be answered about how to proceed. For example, how can sensitive commercial information be protected under circumstances where legally binding rules of confidentiality may be lacking? We look to the Soviet delegation to take the lead in developing answers.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to stress the need for a truly global prohibition of chemical weapons. Much attention has been devoted to security in Europe. But events of the past few years make clear that the greatest risk of the use of chemical weapons lies outside Europe—as demonstrated in the Middle East. We share the view, expressed by the distinguished representative of Egypt, Ambassador Elaraby, at the plenary on April 26, that the convention should be universal in character. A convention that does not deal effectively with the dreadful

reality that chemical weapons capabilities are very widespread cannot be considered successful.

Our objective is a very challenging one—to secure the participation in the convention of all CW-possessing and CW-capable states. Pessimists argue that this is impossible and that therefore states should set their aspirations much lower. We cannot agree. Rather, we support the constructive and creative proposal by the Egyptian delegation that ways be found to consult key states that are not now participating in the negotiations. Similar ideas have been expressed by Ambassador Solesby of the United Kingdom and Ambassador Rose of the German Democratic Republic. We share the view that consultations would help to promote the desired universality. We pledge our cooperation with the delegation of Egypt and other concerned states to bring this proposal to fruition.

VOLUNTARY NATIONAL YOUTH SERVICE ACT

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a future that depends on the education of our youngsters today. Now more than ever, education must be geared toward producing the type of citizens that will enable us to be the strongest, most competitive, and most compassionate Nation on the face of the Earth.

Our future is filled with problems that will have to be addressed by our children. A looming deficit, the largest elderly population ever, the destruction of the ozone layer, the spread of the AIDS virus, the explosion of homelessness, and the crumbling of our Nation's infrastructures are the challenges that we and our children must be prepared to overcome within the next decade.

To accomplish these monumental tasks, our children will have to respond with creativity. And we are making a mistake if we assume that our children will learn how to be creative by simply working harder at the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Our children will have to work smarter; they will have to channel their intellect and energy into a lifestyle that is focused on improving community and country. It should be part of our Nation's commitment to education to train our youngsters in vital human skills.

We in Congress have the opportunity to contribute to this new era in education by supporting the Voluntary National Youth Service Act. This initiative will expand the definition of education by requiring students to apply "book-learning" to community service activities.

The Voluntary National Youth Service Act allows youth ages 17 to 24 to work in local government and nonprofit organizations which address the important social and environmental needs of a community.

Youngsters would work for a period of 6 months to 2 years as full-time volunteers to a much needed service. A local youth service program would provide the living necessities of housing, food, and stipends for the participants. Special financial assistance would be

provided to disadvantaged students much the same way financial aid is provided for college.

Participants would be required to have a high school diploma or equivalent. Moreover, the Federal guidelines encourage the local organizations to offer valuable career training. States would also be expected to contribute to the future of individual participants by offering scholarships for future academic study.

The act would require financial coordination between Federal, State, and local governments in order to tailor a program to the specific needs of both the local youth and community.

Thus, the program is designed to highlight the significant relationship between education, career goals, and community service.

The Voluntary National Youth Service Act is the type of national initiative that we in Congress should offer our educators and students. In the future, the only way that our children can help themselves is by helping others. We need to incorporate the teaching of basic skills with teaching our children how to care for their fellow citizens and for their country.

As the world's largest debtor Nation, we can no longer depend just on our economic structure to glide us through the myriad of problems that are before us. We can no longer remain oblivious to the problems which plague society today. It is vital that our children realize that it is the human element that determines the level of our cohesion, determination, and success in facing the challenge of the future.

As policymakers, we in Congress must ensure that by the end of this century we have the best educated, best trained, and the most dedicated work force in the world. With innovative programs such as the Voluntary National Youth Service Act, I believe we can accomplish this goal.

SDI: A LASTING LEGACY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is time to reexamine our current SDI policy. It is time to endorse a limited ABM deployment as SDI's first layer to guarantee that President Reagan will leave office having put SDI on a firmer political and military foundation.

I am convinced that SDI is technically feasible, and that with concentrated effort it can be perfected within a decade. Certainly our history shows that we have the capacity to achieve this type of technological goal. The Soviet Union has developed, tested, and even deployed advanced ballistic missile defense technologies for a number of years and, indeed, is the only country that maintains an operational ballistic missile defense system. Unilateral Soviet deployment of an advanced system capable of countering Western ballistic missiles—added to the Soviets' already impressive air and other defense capabilities—would have major, adverse consequences for deterrent stability and for the security of the United States and its allies.

It is unacceptable that the Soviet Government should provide for the survival of its people, while the United States makes little or no effort to do the same for its citizens. We must use all the advanced technology that we have at our disposal to defend the people of the United States against the horror of nuclear war.

For these reasons I favor the development and deployment of SDI as soon as is technically feasible. SDI cannot become a "bargaining chip" in future arms control negotiations with the Soviets; it represents the world's best hope for a nuclear weapon-free future. I would like to urge my colleagues to endorse a limited ABM deployment as SDI's first layer. I would also like to submit the following article for careful consideration by my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 20, 1988]

SDI: A LASTING LEGACY?

(By J.D. Crouch)

It would be difficult to find many Americans who, after watching President Reagan's now famous strategic defense initiative speech of March 23, 1983, though he was initiating something other than the creation of anti-missile defenses for the U.S. Reflecting on five years of the Reagan administration's SDI policy, it is now clear that nothing could be further from the truth.

A crucial test of a president's determination to see his policies succeed is how he prepares them for his inevitable passing from the political scene. In the case of SDI, the legacy is so uncertain it is doubtful that the program—which former Undersecretary of Defense Fred Ikle called the "very core" of the administration's strategic policy—will endure much beyond February 1989, no matter who wins the election in November.

TIGHTER BUDGETS

Consider the following difficulties:

SDI has never had the enthusiastic support of military leaders—not because they deny its military and strategic necessity, but because it competes for resources in tighter and tighter budgets. More important, strategic defenses would so alter our military strategy that traditional career patterns within the armed services would be challenged, just as the airplane and aircraft carrier forever altered the Navy earlier in this century.

Instead of assigning the strategic defense mission to a dedicated operational command—no command in the entire armed forces yet has the mission to defend us from Soviet nuclear missiles—and thereby forcing the armed services to compete over deployment dollars for anti-missile weapons, the administration set SDI apart from the uniformed Pentagon by creating the Strategic Defense Initiative Office. SDIO is a civilian organization run through the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It has no base or constituency in the armed services; indeed, its creation was lauded by the military because its pro-research, anti-procurement orientation virtually ensured that no anti-missile system would ever eat from that part of the Pentagon pie devoted to traditional tasks.

SDI is so enmeshed in the arms-control process that it is almost inconceivable that a Start deal—which the president is said to want badly—will be signed without some limitation on it. The administration started down this slippery slope in March 1986 by acceding to the Soviets' demand that "space weapons" (read SDI) be included on the

arms-control agenda before they would return to the table.

If the SDI program is the "very core" of the administration's strategic policy, it would follow that it must be protected from the arms-control process at all costs. Instead, this embrace of arms control as good for the SDI program has meant that all SDI decisions—even those pertaining to military and strategic matters; such as testing promising technologies—must be vetted through the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. These institutions, whose world views are anathema to SDI, view the program's primary purpose as a bargaining chip for another arms agreement with the Soviets. Maybe what SDI has been all along is, in the words of Bud McFarlane, former national security adviser, the "greatest sting operation in history."

There has been no commitment to deployment of SDI by President Reagan. Such a commitment would establish a challenge for the nation's scientists, its military and political leaders, and the people themselves. Consider where we would have been in July 1969 if President Kennedy had some eight years earlier declared in a speech that the country was going to see if it might one day perchance find itself with the capability to go the moon. Would the Eagle have landed? Or would the naysayers, who were as plentiful on that question in 1961 as they are on SDI today, have so muddled the issue that the program would have been diverted to nothing more than pure research?

Lack of a clear deployment commitment is having a negative effect on Capitol Hill in three ways. First, it increases the justification for congressional meddling in the program. Ironically, many of the positive changes in the program have come about as a result of constructive criticism of SDI from Capitol Hill. Most of the meddling, though, has been purposefully destructive, but difficult to prevent because of the unclear and intangible objectives of the program.

Second, it is impossible to sustain major increases in research budget as defense dollars get tight. It is difficult to convince even pro-defense congressmen that they should postpone cutting metal for real weapon systems in favor of SDI when they have no reason to believe that the program will ever create a real system.

Third, the lack of a commitment to deployment has allowed SDI to become all things to all people. Virtually everyone in Congress supports SDI. The anti-SDI crowd can easily feign support for the program at home while fighting to the death for cuts in the research in Washington. After all, the only difference between Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R. Wyo.) and Rep. Ronald Dellums (D., Calif.) on SDI is how much money to devote to research!

A solid commitment to deployment would force the opponents out of this comfortable position and make them justify their "defense is bad" position before the American people. The current situation is the worst of all worlds: Endless support for a research program cannot be sustained and, in losing votes on cutting the research budget, it is not possible to capitalize on the political fruits of defeat.

Finally, the administration has not faced the facts about the ABM Treaty. It does not serve our security interests. It is being heavily violated by the Soviets. And the deal implicit in the 1972 SALT I bargain—that the U.S. will limit its defenses if the Soviet Union will limit its offenses—has never been

honored by the Russians. Indeed, even if there is a 50% reduction in Soviet strategic nuclear weapons, the Soviets would still have three times as many warheads as they did when the ABM Treaty was signed.

The official administration policy is paradoxically "to restore the integrity of the ABM Treaty." The treaty states clearly that neither nation will "deploy AMB systems for a defense of the territory of its country." Doesn't that sound awfully like what the SDI program is supposed to do? How can we pursue SDI and restore the integrity of the ABM Treaty at the same time? The answer is, we can't.

A SLOW DEATH

President Reagan's embrace of the ABM Treaty could easily saddle the nation with that document for 15 more years. This means not only that no anti-missile defense will be deployed, but that the research program he created will die the slow death of congressional strangulation, as did the ABM programs of the 1970s. What the president needed to do was launch a strong frontal attack against the idea behind the treaty: that defenselessness provides more security than defense.

If the above is a pessimistic picture, it is also an agenda for making SDI a national issue in this campaign. There is nothing inevitable about the demise of the SDI program. But if America is to be defended, the keepers of the flame must be willing to push the program far beyond where it has come in the past five years.

REAGAN'S SDI LEGACY

Michael Dukakis declared last week that the U.S. doesn't "need" a strategic defense initiative, while Vice President Bush has so far endorsed only more research with possible deployment well into the future. It seems time for Ronald Reagan to consider what he can do to help SDI survive his presidency.

One proposal now being considered by Defense Secretary Carlucci is to commit to deploy a limited first-stage defense as early as 1994. Defense contractors have already received word from the Pentagon to develop plans for a limited defense that would protect the national command authority (the President and Defense Secretary) and include a "footprint" to cover part of the Eastern U.S. The idea would represent the first tangible step toward a nationwide anti-missile defense based both in space and on the ground.

The Reagan administration has long resisted such a first-stage deployment, fearing it would undermine plans for more significant space-based defenses. But the politics of SDI are changing. Senator Sam Nunn has proposed studying a similar accidental-launch defense. Support is growing in Congress. And last month the Defense Science Board's SDI task force urged "deployment as a sequence of steps, each accomplishing a useful mission."

Virtually any defense would be better than our current game of nuclear roulette. Today a U.S. President is unprotected against a sneak attack by even a single submarine off the U.S. coast; an offshore sub's low-trajectory ballistic missiles take only a few minutes to strike. A defense of the U.S. capital with even 100 interceptors would mean the Soviets would need two or more subs to be confident of a successful attack, increasing the chance of U.S. detection and warning. A President would have more time to escape, while the Soviets couldn't cover

every escape route. An attack that's less likely to succeed is also less likely to happen. Deterrence would be enhanced.

With more than one type of interceptor, the same deployment could also defend, say, Boston or Miami against a small accidental Soviet launch or a rogue attack by the likes of Colonel Ghadhafi. Secretary of State Shultz warned last week about the spread of nuclear technology to the Third World, and Chinese missile technology has already spread to the Middle East. Since such a defense also wouldn't violate the ABM Treaty—which allows the U.S. one defense site with 100 interceptors—there aren't any good arguments against it.

One alternative would be to base the ABM site near America's missile fields in Grand Forks, North Dakota. This would protect a larger portion of the U.S. against an accidental or madman launch, though it wouldn't help much against an offshore submarine attack aimed at Washington. In any case, it's at least a step forward to debate not whether to have a defense but where to put it.

SDI's critics will insist, to be sure, that talk of limited deployment is a repudiation of Ronald Reagan's vision of a leak-proof SDI Astrodome. It needn't be. As the Defense Science Board has pointed out, a limited deployment would teach valuable lessons about how defensive systems work, bring defense into the military chain of command, and get production lines rolling as a way to counter growing Soviet anti-missile defenses. Having a defense over part of the U.S. also helps build political momentum for defending all of it.

We're also told the Joint Chiefs oppose any deployment, which is only typical of a bureaucracy preoccupied with budgets. As peacetime generals, the chiefs worry less about what might happen in an actual war. A few might be willing to go along with a limited deployment, though only in return for scrapping current plans for a "Phase One" space defense by the mid-1990s. And no doubt Secretary of State Shultz would be delighted to agree so he could give away SDI for another treaty with the Soviets. That scenario would of course kill SDI.

As J.D. Crouch observes nearby, there is an alternative: Endorse a limited ABM deployment as SDI's first layer. Ronald Reagan can't guarantee what a future President will do, but he can at least leave office having put SDI on a firmer political and military foundation. He can leave a tangible legacy by deciding to deploy something real.

HOPE SPIVEY NAMED TO WOMEN'S U.S. OLYMPIC GYMNASTICS

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been reading a great deal about our Olympic athletes who are currently competing for spots on the various teams which will represent the United States at the 1988 games in Seoul.

Some teams have been named and I will include the gymnastic's roster printed in the August 7, 1988, issue of the Washington Post at the end of these remarks. It is tough to make any Olympic team and, therefore, it is with a great deal of pride to call attention to

Hope Spivey of the Parkette National Gymnastic Center of Allentown, PA. I do this knowing full well that Hope is a strong advocate of promoting a united team spirit in a sport which requires a dedicated individual effort.

A great amount of training is required to achieve the skill level necessary to compete on an international level. As Jodi Duckett in the August 8, 1988, issue of the Allentown Morning Call wrote, it's a "20-year-old dream realized." Hope came to the Lehigh Valley 4 years ago from Suffolk, VA, and joined the Parkettes under Coach Bill Strauss. In that time, some of Hope's accomplishments are:

First, became a member of the senior national team for the past 3 years;

Second, competed in many international competitions including the Goodwill Games in Moscow;

Third, became a member of the Gold Medal Pan America Team; and

Fourth, placed third in the U.S. Olympic Team trials.

Jodi Duckett also emphasized in her article, "Spivey said despite their personal disappointments, her Parkette friends are rooting for her. 'They've been supportive,' said Spivey. 'I think they were just as happy for me as I was happy for myself' * * *"

It is with that attitude, on September 7, Hope Spivey will leave for Seoul to compete with the best in the world. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we will also need that attitude among our coaches. They must produce the team spirit so important to the mental and emotional stability of the athletes, critical in any Olympic effort.

I take this opportunity on behalf of all my constituents in the Lehigh Valley, to extend best wishes not only to Hope but our entire Olympic squad along with those who competed and did not make it.

[From the Washington Post Aug. 7, 1988]

U.S. OLYMPIC GYMNASTICS TEAMS

Men, hometown:

Charles Lakes, Chatsworth, Calif.;

Scott Johnson, Lincoln, Neb.;

Kevin Davis, Lithonia, Ga.;

Wes Suter, Reston, Va.;

Lance Ringnald, Albuquerque; and

Dominick Minicucci, Staten Island, N.Y.

Women, hometown:

Phoebe Mills, Northfield, Ill.;

K. Garrison-Steves, Altus, Okla.;

Hope Spivey, Allentown, Pa.;

Brandy Johnson, Altamonte Springs, Fla.;

Chelle Stack, Birmingham; and

Missy Marlowe, Salt Lake City.

Men's alternate: Tom Schlesinger, Boulder, Colo.

Women's alternates: Rhonda Faehn, Coon Rapids, Minn.; Kristie Phillips, Houston, Tex.

WALTER D. HYLE, JR.

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I've said many times before and will certainly continue to say many times hence—I love America's veterans, each and every one. This is a love

which I am proud to have, an affection which I hope all my colleagues share with me. Indeed I am always proud to have the chance to honor those special vets who have made it their cause to fight for the rights of all who fought for this great country.

Today I am honored to salute Mr. Walter D. Hyle, Jr. In his lifetime Walter has been a tireless voice for the rights of all American veterans. Now he is retiring after 8 years as adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland, Inc. Walter has been associated with military and veterans' affairs for the past 50 years. I think that it is truly fitting that his most recent efforts have been on behalf of perhaps the most overlooked category of American veterans—those that gave up a limb, an eye, or sustained permanent and painful injuries while on the battlefield. This is a great man, and I feel that it is only right that his story be told here.

Walter answered his country's call to duty in 1949. He subsequently served as both an enlisted man and an officer in Maryland's 29th Division. After the war he immersed himself in a variety of different veteran's causes, a choice which was later to dominate his life. He organized the Joint Veterans Committee and was named Veteran of the Year in 1964. He was founder and president of the Patriots of Fort McHenry whose principal project is the restoration of our national monument by that name. In addition, he has been past State and national commander of the Catholic War Veterans Association as well as serving as a member of the National Jewish War Veterans organization. Walter also has been president of the U.S. Civil Defense Council as well as a loyal member of the American Legion. Prior to becoming adjutant of Maryland's Disabled American Veterans he was the organization's State commander.

His activities were not limited to veterans groups but encompassed many charities as well. He presently sits on the executive committee of the March of Dimes in addition to participating in the Save A Heart Foundation's many activities. These organizations have greatly benefited from Walter Hyle's leadership in the past, and I am sure that they will continue to do so in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, Walter Hyle is a man worthy of the highest praise—a gentleman who certainly has earned his retirement. I only hope that his successors at Maryland's Disabled American Veterans organization carry out their duties with the same zeal and concern that he has exhibited so many times in the past.

Thank you, Walter, and congratulations for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. BETSY PARTEN

HON. CLAUDE HARRIS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, litter and illegal dumping is defacing our countryside. I rise to call attention to this serious problem and to pay tribute to Mrs. Betsy Parten. Mrs. Parten, one of my constituents, has done an out-

standing job of preventing litter and illegal dumping in Choctaw County, AL.

Since October 1986, Mrs. Parten has coordinated the Keep Choctaw County Beautiful Program. Her success with this program has been remarkable and has attracted widespread attention. In fact, Mrs. Parten was named as a finalist in the National Take Pride in America Campaign. She was one of five Alabamians recognized for her achievements in this area.

In Choctaw County, Mrs. Parten has organized countywide cleanup days, persuading civic organizations in each municipality to pick up trash and litter. She has convinced the courts to allow first-time offenders to work off a portion of their sentences by picking up trash and litter by the roadside in the various towns of Choctaw County. She has worked with local schools initiating clean-campus programs and teaching children and young people the importance of keeping their entire community clean. In addition, she has run logo and poster contests, distributed free litter bags, and worked with the news media to promote awareness about litter and to inform the citizens of Choctaw County how to stop this problem in their communities.

Mrs. Parten and the Keep Choctaw County Beautiful Campaign have worked in close alliance with the State health department and forestry commission to combat illegal dumping. Investigations by these agencies at illegal dump sites have resulted in a number of apprehensions and these former dump sites have been cleaned up.

In short, Betsy Parten and the Keep Choctaw County Beautiful Campaign have made a significant contribution to Choctaw County and the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. I applaud Mrs. Parten and the work she is doing and I urge others to look to her example of success in eliminating the blight of litter and illegal dumping from our land.

CONGRATULATING YOUNG ACHIEVERS

HON. JOSEPH E. BRENNAN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, recently at the University of Maryland, College Park, a series of events were held in which 602 teams of young people from 46 States, the District of Columbia, four Canadian Provinces, Mexico, and the People's Republic of China came together to compete and learn together through a series of challenging problem-solving games.

I am referring to the ninth Odyssey of the Mind World Finals. The Odyssey of the Mind is a program developed to challenge the leaders of tomorrow by giving them the opportunity to participate in unusual challenges which test their creativity and imagination. I am proud to say that my own State of Maine sent a total of 12 schools to this event and that they scored consistently at the top of their rankings.

Mr. Speaker, programs such as these serve a great purpose; they cultivate the talents of

our young people and help them develop into competent leaders of their generation. With the help of this program and others like it, we can be confident that those who lead this country in the coming years will have the imagination to dream about a better world and the creativity to help those dreams come true.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate those students who participated in this exercise and to thank those who administer the program for a job well-done and to encourage them to continue the good work of helping our young people expand their intellectual horizons.

SOCIAL SECURITY: A COMMITMENT TO THE FUTURE

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that I believe will lay the groundwork for long-term solvency for the Social Security System and assure that our children and grandchildren benefit from a system that has served generations of Americans so admirably. I want to thank and commend my colleagues and original cosponsors of the legislation, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. PACKARD for their courage and foresight in joining me to undertake this initiative.

Social Security has helped provide peace of mind to millions of retirees since its inception. Current retirees are, on average, getting almost \$3 in benefits for every dollar they contributed during their working years. It is clear, however, that a child born this year will not be able to rely on the present system for his or her retirement security. Actuarial and demographic projections indicated that in the first half of the 21st century the Social Security surplus will rise quickly and dramatically, but under the demands of a large retiree population the trust fund will be depleted by the year 2050.

Recently, the editorial pages of several major daily papers have carried columns discussing the Social Security trust fund surplus and its relationship to the budget deficit, national debt, and future Social Security benefits. Together, these reports foreshadow a serious problem for America.

What are the options? As it has done in the past, Congress could watch the Social Security surplus grow and eventually spend substantial amounts of it on increased benefits or new Government programs. Or, it could cut Social Security contribution tax rate while maintaining current benefits, which would cause the impending trust fund bankruptcy to occur much sooner. Or it could take a third, responsible step embodied in legislation I am introducing that I hope will provide stability and long-term solvency for our Social Security System.

The bill would direct the Board of Trustees of the Social Security trust fund to study the feasibility of redirecting employer and employee Social Security tax contributions not needed to finance current payment of retirement benefits into individual retirement ac-

counts for workers currently paying the Social Security payroll tax. Future Social Security benefits would be adjusted to reflect the retirement benefits gained from such accounts.

This legislation would also take Social Security off-budget on September 30, 1989. Receipts from the Social Security tax are currently included when calculating the annual deficit, and these receipts are not scheduled to go off-budget until fiscal year 1993. The current and growing Social Security surplus distorts the true size of our operating deficit by having Social Security surpluses count in figuring our general fund deficit.

Providing each American worker his or her own privately held Social Security retirement account would accomplish several worthwhile goals—including stability and accountability. Long-term solvency for Social Security will never be accomplished if Congress continues to tamper with benefits to suit its own political purposes.

By taking the fate of our children and grandchildren's economic future out of the hands of Congress and the bureaucracy and putting it back in the hands of the people it was originally designed to benefit, we can assure that this program, which has served two generations of Americans, will be there to provide retirement security for Americans well into the 20th century.

In addition, the ultimate establishment of a vested, fully funded Social Security System would build a base of private savings and investment capital in our country that would ensure strong economic growth in the future and alleviate our dependency on foreign capital infusions.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to ensure to seniors and those who will become seniors and entitled to Social Security benefits, a strong, sound, viable system that they can absolutely rely on. But this obligation extends not only to present generations, but generations to come. The coming surplus in the Social Security trust fund can be looked on as political cover for ignoring the deficit and an opportunity to create extensive new spending programs at the future expenses of Americans who do not yet have the right to vote. Or the surplus can be viewed as providing an opportunity to look ahead and plan and set in place a vested and funded Social Security System that will provide in the future, retirement benefits every bit as generous as the wonderful system we have now provides currently to retirees, and perhaps even better, and would afford our country the strong foundation of savings and investment it now lacks.

DUKAKIS' DANGEROUS IDEAS

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat nominee of the Presidential election, Michael Dukakis, has recently been dabbling in the foreign policy and defense spheres, an area that has been somewhat alien to the Massachusetts Governor. However, with a little help from his Harvard cabal of "experts" Governor Du-

kakis has outlined what he considers to be the Nation's national security priorities and what the country might expect from a Dukakis administration. I can think of no better individual than former U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick to dissect these ivory tower beliefs which she did in a recent Washington Post editorial.

DUKAKIS' DANGEROUS IDEAS—HIS ODD DEPARTURES ON FOREIGN POLICY ALL BUT GUARANTEE HIS DEFEAT

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

At last we have begun the discussion of foreign policy in the 1988 presidential campaign.

In his appearance before the Atlantic Council last week, Michael Dukakis finally told us where he stands on major issues of national security. Those stands will, I believe, guarantee his defeat in November—providing, of course, that George Bush makes no serious mistakes and helps the American people understand why the Dukakis positions are extremely dangerous to the United States.

In a wide-ranging speech on security issues, Dukakis outlined a strategy differing sharply from that of recent Republican and Democratic administrations, and from traditional NATO plans.

Again and again, in his prepared text and in response to questions, Dukakis explained his priorities: to enhance U.S. nonnuclear "conventional" capacities, to eliminate several major nuclear weapons systems, including the mobile MX and the Midgetman, and of course to stop the development of a strategic missile defense.

"We don't need SDI; we need CDI ["conventional defense initiative"] . . . We don't need MX missiles running around on railroad cars; we need an anti-tank weapon that can stop Soviet tanks," he said.

Although Dukakis believes we have a "massive and survivable nuclear deterrent," he did no imply—nor does he presumably believe—that our security can be guaranteed by a strategy of mutually assured destruction. Otherwise he would have shown more concern with nuclear force modernization and less with enhancing conventional forces.

In fact, almost all NATO strategists strongly support enhancement of conventional forces, but they do so in a context of comprehensive force modernization. By decoupling conventional force enhancement and nuclear force enhancement, Dukakis seemed to suggest conventional forces could substitute for nuclear deterrence.

The most disturbing aspect of Dukakis' approach was his apparent unconcern with the defense of the United States itself.

The vulnerability of the United States is the most important fact of our times. Most Americans still do not understand that improvements in the accuracy and speed of Soviet missiles and the silencing of Soviet submarines have rendered the United States more vulnerable than at any time in its history. It is a new fact, it is unwelcome, we do not want to know it, we do not like to think about it. Even our "war games" do not incorporate into their scenarios the possibility of a direct threat to U.S. territory.

Yet, for the first time in our history, a potential adversary has the capacity to destroy American cities, populations, productive and defense capacities in a matter of minutes. The oceans which through two centuries have protected the United States against foreign incursions are today a

medium for newly silenced submarines to gain access to those shores.

American vulnerability should be the starting point for any serious consideration of U.S. security policy. Otherwise, our discussions are as idle as the plans of French generals who, in the decade after World War I, conceived and built elaborate concrete fortifications that were exactly the sort of thing France had needed in that war. The Maginot Line proved utterly useless against Adolf Hitler's mobilized armies and blitzkrieg tactics.

France's defenses failed because her generals had failed to understand the revolution in technology and tactics of war. Conventional thinking and conventional defenses failed France, as conventional thinking and conventional defenses can fail the United States.

In our times, it is not easy to keep a nation's defenses paced with scientific innovation and military application. It is much easier and much more pleasant to think about glasnost than to keep track of Soviet research, development and deployment of improved offensive and defensive missiles—none of which has been affected by Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms.

Dukakis' first serious venture into foreign policy suggests that he has not yet faced the fact that the first responsibility of the next American President will be to provide for the defense of the continental United States. To the contrary, the types of weapons needed for such defense are precisely those Dukakis proposes to eliminate or downgrade.

One hopes that Dukakis will soon turn his attention to this most urgent problem. At the very least, he should tell us how he plans to utilize the proposed tanks to defend the United States against still-growing arsenals of Soviet land- and sea-launched nuclear missiles.

THE NEED FOR QUALITY, LICENSED CHILD CARE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor or H.R. 3660, the Act for Better Child Care, introduced by my friend and colleague, DALE KILDEE of Michigan, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter to the editor which appeared in the Washington Post on July 31, 1988.

To working parents in my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, finding good, affordable child care is difficult. The ABC bill is a thoughtful, comprehensive response to our current child care crisis. ABC gives parents real choices in child care by increasing both the supply and diversity of child care. Furthermore, it would help low- and moderate-income parents pay for child care.

However, America's children must be cared for in a safe environment. ABC would establish basic health and safety protections for all children in child care. In a recent poll, 75 percent of American voters said it was essential that national policies assure good child care by setting standards. With good reason, Federal regulations have eliminated dangerous chemicals and contaminated foods. Why is it

that we can mandate the safety of toys used in day care centers, but it is unthinkable to regulate the health and safety of the children themselves?

A recent letter to the editor appearing in the Washington Post was from a mother who had arranged for an unlicensed provider to care for her child. When someone turned the caregiver in, the caregiver decided to go out of business rather than subject herself to State licensing requirements. The letter has been used by various individuals as an argument against government intervention in the care of children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the response letter, which also appeared in the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD. The letter is from Carolyn Pierce, a licensed family day-care provider in Prince Georges County—my home district. Speaking from her own experience, Ms. Pierce describes the numerous advantages to ensuring basic protections for our children. I urge my colleagues to read her letter.

ROUND 2: GLADYS SHOULD GET A LICENSE

(By Carolyn Pierce)

Judy Kaplan Warner bemoans the fact that "someone" reported Gladys, her daughter's unlicensed day care provider, and rather than get a license, Gladys decided to close down [Close to Home, July 17].

I am a licensed day care provider in Prince George's County, and I say hurrah for that someone! Warner's sad diatribe of her "plight" infuriated me. I hope her article will not discourage the community from continuing to report unlicensed day care homes.

Yes, Maryland has mandatory licensing for day care homes. This law works to the benefit of everyone—the parents, the providers and most of all the children. Warner's anger is misdirected. Instead of lashing out at the state of Maryland for requiring day care licensing, she should be angry at Gladys for not caring enough to get a license.

Warner says she and the other parents "don't care one bit" that Gladys isn't licensed. While Gladys sounds like a good provider—and I don't doubt Warner's claim that she gives the children loving care—I have a few concerns:

Is Gladys' home safe? Not just the parts you can see, but the parts you can't too? A representative of the state looks inside cabinets and closets for poison and fire hazards. Does Gladys' home have smoke detectors and a fire extinguisher in good working order? Does she have an emergency plan to get all of the children out in case of fire?

Does Gladys have an immunization certificate on file for each child in her care? Are they all up-to-date on their shots? And what about a notarized emergency medical consent, signed by the parents of each child, which would authorize Gladys to consent to emergency medical treatment if the parents were unreachable? Without one, a child would only be treated in a life-or-death situation. In a lesser emergency—for example, a broken arm—a child could spend considerable time in pain in the emergency room while the parent was being tracked down.

How many children is Gladys caring for, and what are their ages? Maryland law allows a maximum of six children in home day care at any time, with no more than two under the age of 2. This number is enough

to challenge the most energetic day care provider, believe me.

As for Gladys's refusal to apply for a license because of the "paper work" and "people coming into your home," I don't buy it. The application consists of four simple forms to be filled out and mailed in. A social worker will then visit the home to interview the provider and to inspect the home for safety and healthy and adequate play, eating and napping space for the children. If any deficiencies are found, the provider is given some time in which to correct them. When everything is satisfactory, the license is issued. Unless a complaint is reported, the provider is not likely to see the social worker again until renewal time two years later, when the process is repeated. The licensing process is free.

Seven thousand home day care providers are licensed in the state of Maryland. If they can do it, why can't Gladys?

I hope Gladys will reconsider. The advantages to her in becoming licensed—and the benefits to the children in her care—would far outweigh the minor effort to apply. Licensed providers receive free referrals from the county when parents call looking for day care. Licensed providers can participate in the federal Child Care Food Program and be reimbursed for each meal and snack served to the children under the program's nutritional guidelines. Since Gladys is already providing meals and snacks, this would in effect increase her income without any additional cost to the parents, and she could probably serve more nutritious food in the process.

Licensed providers can receive free counseling from their licensing worker about any problem that comes up in their day care business. (Yes, day care is a small business.) And licensed providers get more respect, from parents and the community, for the very important service they perform.

A license is not a guarantee of quality day care, but it assures the state and the parents that the basics are in place. If Gladys isn't willing to take the simple steps to get licensed Warner should make a careful search of licensed homes in her area. I am sure that she will find the quality day care she desires for her daughter—given by a provider who abides by the law.

ALOYSIUS MAZEWSKI

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, all Americans lost a great friend last week when Aloysius Mazewski passed away.

President of the Polish National Alliance and the Polish American Congress, he was a national leader in Polish-American affairs and exercised a great influence with political leaders of both parties.

President Reagan and five previous Presidents often sought his counsel on foreign affairs and he had friends in many countries of the world.

Al was a lawyer who was honored many times by his profession and had served as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations in 1970.

He had a warm engaging personality and a bright sense of humor.

I knew Al Mazewski well for 30 years. He was a fine man, a great patriot, and a very

good friend. I will miss him, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his wonderful family.

DEAN DON EDWARDS AND ARMS CONTROLLER EDITH WILKIE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent Golden State Report articles regarding my friend and colleague, the dean of the California Democratic delegation, DON EDWARDS and his wife Edith Wilkie, the executive director of the arms control and foreign policy caucus. As these excellent articles point out, each has worked to bring more bipartisan cooperation to their respective organizations in Congress. And both Edie and DON are highly respected for their impressive achievements in Congress.

Edie Wilkie has helped mold the arms control and disarmament caucus into one of the most effective and respected legislative service organizations on the Hill. In recent years the caucus has expanded its efforts to include the broad range of arms control and proliferation issues which deserve to be at the top of Congress' list. In addition, it produces some of the most useful information of any legislative service organization on the Hill.

I have been an admirer of DON EDWARDS since long before my election to Congress. The opportunity I have had to work with him for the last 5 years has only served to increase the respect and admiration I have for him and his abilities as a legislator.

Under DON EDWARDS' inspired leadership the California delegation has become one of the most united and effective delegations in Congress. I look forward to working with him for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to the attention of our colleagues:

EDWARDS & WILKIE: CALIFORNIA'S PEACE TICKET

(By Steven Pressman)

In an age of conservatism, Don Edwards has remained an unabashed liberal. During the Reagan era, he has stood guard over a congressional graveyard where some of the president's cherished legislative dreams have remained buried for years.

Among his colleagues in the fractious California House delegation, he has tried to be something of a peacekeeper. That's not easy, because the political Cold War that divides the state's Democratic and Republican lawmakers has proven to be an imposing obstacle to legislative detente.

Politics is much more harmonious in Edwards' own household. While he has long focused his energies on domestic liberal causes, Edwards' wife, Edith Wilkie, concentrates on more global matters. For the last several years, she has been the executive director of Congress' Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, a liberal-tinged bipartisan group of Senators and House members.

And after 25 years in Congress, Edwards—one of three most senior members of the largest state congressional delegation—is still ready to fight new political battles. At

the age of 73, he shows no signs of slowing down.

"I played four sets of tennis and 18 holes of golf the other week, and I didn't even get tired," he said recently during an interview in his Washington office with a commanding view of the Capitol. "So the old bones are still pretty active."

A glance at the rating scores that various interest groups tally up for members of Congress explains why the San Jose Democrat enjoys his reputation as a tireless fighter for liberal causes. Throughout the Reagan years, he has racked up six straight years of perfect 100 percent scores from Americans for Democratic Action, one of the bellwether tests of true liberalism. (During Ronald Reagan's first year in office, Edwards somehow slipped to a 95 percent ADA score.)

To complete the symmetry, his report card from the American Conservative Union has remained steady at zero during Reagan's two terms in the White House. Edwards probably considers the flunking mark from the conservative group as a badge of honor.

In California, Edwards represents a solidly Democratic district, to be sure. It is not, however, the kind of district that necessarily shares all of Edwards' political views. He has been an outspoken foe of just about everything that Reagan has stood for as president, and yet in his district Reagan edged out Walter Mondale in presidential balloting four years ago, largely with the help of a lot of blue-collar votes in Fremont.

Over the years, Edwards' political opponents have tried to exploit his liberalism to their advantage, but he always has managed to disarm them when balloting time comes around. He won re-election with 62 percent of the vote the same year that Reagan was carrying the district in the 1984 presidential race. Two years later, Edwards upped his total to 71 percent.

He is among the relatively few members of Congress who define their political roles beyond the boundaries of their own districts. "We're not here in Congress just to represent 550,000 people, although that's an important part of it," he says. "But we're here to help create a national and an international agenda."

During Reagan's presidency, Edwards has been spending much of his time stymying White House initiatives, while battling to enact social legislation over administration resistance. The Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, which he chairs—along with the full Judicial Committee headed by retiring Rep. Peter Rodino, D-N.J.—has become the graveyard for cherished Reaganite goals such as a balanced budget amendment and anti-abortion measures.

Edwards and the committee also have been in the forefront of other legislative fights with the White House over issues such as reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act and a controversial civil rights measure passed over Reagan's veto. The civil rights bill reversed a Supreme Court decision that had narrowed the scope of earlier civil rights legislation.

While Edwards' philosophical allies have cheered him on, his opponents have decried the tactics he has used to undermine some of the cornerstones of Reagan's agenda. "Your aggravation level reaches a certain point to where it becomes total frustration," says Rep. Dan Lungren, the Long Beach Republican who is leaving the House this year. A member of the Judiciary Committee, Lun-

gren resigned from Edwards' subcommittee a few years ago over the Democrat's handling of legislation to extend the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

The flap revolved around aborted efforts to work out a compromise between Edwards and Rep. Henry Hyde of Illinois, who was the senior Republican on the panel at the time. Lungren and Hyde accused Edwards of sneaking behind their backs by negotiating with other Republicans instead. Edwards ended up apologizing to Hyde over the incident, and says the two have since patched over the bruised feelings. But Hyde, like Lungren, left the subcommittee because of what happened.

Edwards makes no apologies, however, for using his powers as a senior Democrat and subcommittee chairman to achieve or to block legislation. "You are elected to use whatever appropriate machinery there is to do what you think is best for the country and for your constituents," he says.

As chairman of the 27-member contingent of House Democrats from California, Edwards has a slightly different role to play. Not only must he try to maintain unity among the state's Democratic lawmakers, but he also must attempt whenever possible to find common cause with the 18 Republican House members on some issues affecting California. A deep political chasm between the two sides has made the bridge-building efforts nearly an impossible task.

Traditionally, the state's senior House member from each party chairs that party's delegation. Among California Democrats, Edwards shares the same seniority with Edward Roybal and Augustus Hawkins, both from Los Angeles. But neither has shown an interest in leading the delegation, so the task has fallen to Edwards ever since Rep. Harold (Blizz) Johnson was defeated in 1980.

In the years since, the Democratic delegation has hired its own staff with computer-equipped offices near the Capitol. Edwards and other delegation members say the Democratic group is more unified now, particularly when it comes to important statewide issues such as offshore oil drilling and agricultural interests.

The unification process also has been made a little easier by some changes in the internal workings of the California Democratic delegation. Gone is the domineering personality of the late Phillip Burton. Another kingpin in the delegation, Tony Coelho, is busy these days climbing up the ladder that leads to the top of the overall House Democratic leadership structure.

"There used to be a lot of little power structures floating around in the delegation," says Rep. Robert Matsui, D-Sacramento. He says Edwards has managed to work effectively with the delegation as a whole, without appearing to compete individually with members on their own favorite turf. "He's got an ego," says Matsui, "but it's a very benign ego."

Relations with California's Republican House members, however, are much more strained, particularly since the bitter fight that erupted over the 1982 reapportionment engineered by Burton. Orange County Republican Bill Dannemeyer refers scornfully to the "absolute raping" of GOP districts that took place in the 1982 remapping of political boundaries. "That raping . . . has colored the whole relationship of the two sides here in the House," he says.

Edwards, for his part, is aware that the reapportionment fight has driven a deep wedge between Democratic and Republican

House members. Still, he maintains a good working relationship with Rep. Carlos Moorhead of Glendale, the dean of California House Republicans. "He (Moorhead) gets criticized by some of them for being too friendly with me. But he can accept that, and so can I," says Edwards.

The two are working on a plan to develop a bipartisan institute that would be based in Washington, where it would serve as a California-oriented think tank to promote the interests of the state. Edwards says such an operation would allow California to compete more effectively for federally funded projects that have ended up elsewhere in the past. He lists the loss of an earthquake center to Buffalo and high-technology projects to other parts of the country as evidence of the need for a better California promotional effort in Washington.

"ABC—anything but California—is an expression around here," says Edwards, explaining the zeal with which other members of Congress challenge the flow of federal dollars to the nation's most populous state.

Strained relations within the congressional delegation obviously don't help, but Edwards also points an accusing finger at Gov. George Deukmejian, who he says doesn't seem to focus much attention on the state's affairs in Washington. "He doesn't put a hard-hitting team together, work with the Legislature and get into the national competition," Edwards says.

For those who agree with Edwards' assessment of Deukmejian, that makes two California governors in a row who have had their problems deciding how to connect the worlds of Sacramento and Washington. Jerry Brown was constantly frustrating the state's congressional delegation by appearing aloof and uncaring about state-related issues. At other times, he would journey to Washington without bothering to tell anyone that he was coming.

Edwards' own journey into the world of liberal causes began years ago in a rather unlikely fashion, when he was state chairman of the California Young Republicans.

An FBI agent in his younger days, Edwards was a business-minded member of the GOP until the age of 35. He became wealthy as the owner of a title insurance company in San Jose.

After the close of World War II, however, Edwards joined the United World Federalists, a world government group, partly in response to his growing fears about the spread of nuclear weapons.

Elected to his statewide GOP post around the same time, Edwards quickly discovered that his sympathetic views toward the United Nations and world peace issues were out of sync with most of his fellow Republicans. He severed his ties with the party and quickly became active with liberal groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union and Americans for Democratic Action.

His 1962 race for Congress marked Edwards' first foray into elective politics. He narrowly edged out two other opponents in the Democratic primary, moving on to an easy win in November in the heavily Democratic district. Once in Washington, he continued his education as a liberal by associating with the likes of civil rights lawyer Joseph Ruah and U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Douglas and his wife Cathy.

In Congress, meanwhile, Edwards wasted no time in boldly declaring his own allegiance to political liberalism. His maiden opportunity to do so came when the House was asked to vote on a routine measure to fund the House Committee on Un-American

Activities. At the time, House members voted individually by voice, as opposed to today's electronic balloting.

When the clerk called for Edwards' vote, the new congressman voted against the bill. "The clerk stopped and looked at me—and I felt every eye in the chamber on me," recalls Edwards.

"He looked and again said, 'Mr. Edwards of California?' And I said, 'Nooooo.' I think there were only about a dozen or so votes against it."

The infamous Un-American Activities Committee—which, years earlier, had helped to propel another California congressman, Richard Nixon, into the national spotlight—was not officially mothballed by the House until the early 1970s. Ironically, some of the committee's jurisdiction transferred to the Judiciary subcommittee that Edwards has chaired for years. "So I've been chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee ever since," he jokes.

He met his wife (it is Edwards' second marriage) several years ago, when she was working on another House member's staff. She later was an administrative assistant to Rep. Portney (Pete) Stark, the Alameda County Democrat, before she became executive director of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus in 1978.

Ask some otherwise knowledgeable Capitol Hill observers about the couple's relationship, and you're likely to get some quizzical glances. "Most people don't know we're married," admits Edwards. "She's a very independent person."

As for Edwards, he says he is not getting tired of serving in Congress. Four years younger than Ronald Reagan, he is already looking forward to politics in the post-Reagan era. "I hope my friends and relatives will tell me when it's time to quit. But I think it's very important to have some older people here . . . And the older I get, the more liberal I become."

CAN A WILKIE BE BIPARTISAN?

As the wife of one of the most liberal Democrats in Congress, Edith Wilkie could be expected to share naturally her husband's partisan leanings. But Wilkie—married to San Jose's Don Edwards—has her own professional responsibilities on Capitol Hill, and they require her to be more bipartisan than her political spouse.

For the past ten years, Wilkie has served as executive director of the congressional Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, a group of 135 senators and House members, that conducts research and analyzes legislation for the benefit of its members.

The fact that the current caucus chairman, Sen. Mark Hatfield of Oregon, is a Republican underscores Wilkie's point about the need for her to avoid a partisan label. "A couple of my best friends often assume that I'm a Democrat, and they assume that because I'm married to one," says Wilkie. "But I assure them that I'm bipartisan."

In fact, she blames both political parties for having avoided strong arms control positions in the past. "I think that both parties have failed to address issues in a way that a lot of people in this country and a lot of members of Congress would want them to," she says. Wilkie thinks the Democratic House leadership has become more visible recently on arms control matters, but she says the Democratic-controlled Senate "still has a way to go" on the subject.

Wilkie may prefer avoiding a Democratic label for herself, but she doesn't hesitate describing the arms control caucus as a liberal-

ly tinged group of lawmakers. (About 80 percent of members are Democratic senators and House members.) But sprinkled throughout the caucus are liberal and moderate Republicans like Hatfield and Sen. John Danforth of Missouri.

Lately, however, it has been the conservative in the White House, Ronald Reagan, who has won plaudits from arms control advocates for his administration's progress in negotiating weapons treaties with the Soviet Union.

Wilkie's own career on Capitol Hill began in 1969, when she joined the staff of Rep. Ogden Reid of New York, a Republican who later switched parties. She also worked for a few years for Rep. Fortney (Pete) Stark, an Oakland Democrat who shares Edwards' unabashed political liberalism.

From there, Wilkie moved to her current job at the arms control caucus, a group which started meeting in 1959 at informal breakfast discussions and later blossomed into a more organized operation during the Vietnam War.

Most congressional spouses play background and supporting roles when it comes to politics. But Don Edwards and Edith Wilkie enjoy going their own ways, and neither thinks the marriage poses any conflicts or difficulties with their own positions.

"We aren't really working on a day-to-day basis in the same legislative vineyards," says Wilkie, noting Edwards' focus on domestic civil rights issues.

"I may be very naive, but I truly believe there is no association here professionally (between her and her husband)," says Wilkie.

"We don't even bounce around at the same parties and receptions on the Hill."

CITY OF LOMPOC CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, California's 19th District is full of beautiful little cities and towns, but one in particular must be mentioned today. The city of Lompoc is celebrating its centennial; and so I know you'll excuse me if I take this opportunity to say a few words about this delightful place, and to congratulate its proud citizenry.

It is interesting to note that Lompoc was originally established as a Temperance Colony, back in 1874. The area's early settlers were a hard working and decent people, eager to raise their families in peace, and to prosper. Lompoc's current residents, many of their direct descendants from those hearty pioneers, have much in common with their antecedents; they are decent, hard working, and dedicated to maintaining the quality of life there.

The citizens of Lompoc, already renowned for its "Flower Festival," have some old-fashioned festivities planned, including a centennial ball, a fireman's muster, fireworks, a fishing derby for the young folks, an annual mud bog, and a street dance. August 12-21 have been designated "Lompoc Centennial Celebration Days."

Mr. Speaker, I just want to extend my sincerest congratulations to the people of

Lompoc, wishing them a hearty happy birthday.

A TRIBUTE TO ANNA HOWARD SHAW

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, in the 10th District of Michigan, we are very honored to have someone from our district who changed the course of U.S. history for every citizen of this Nation. In fact, I am privileged to have the opportunity to bring to the attention of all my colleagues a remarkable woman, Anna Howard Shaw.

Through the efforts of Anna Howard Shaw, the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified. Today, the rights of citizens of the United States to vote cannot be denied on account of their gender.

Anna Howard Shaw led an incredibly active life. She was born in England in 1847, and then at the age of 4 Anna's family moved to Massachusetts. Eventually, they settled in the city of Big Rapids in the great State of Michigan. Anna taught in a frontier school at the age of 15 and attended Big Rapids High School. She was active in the Methodist Church and preached her first sermon in 1870. Anna became a licensed Methodist preacher in 1871 and later the Nation's first ordained female minister of the Methodist Church in 1880. She earned a medical doctorate from Boston University, which was rare for a woman in those days. Anna also became the second woman to receive the Presidential Civilian Distinguished Service Medal for her leadership during World War I.

Anna was dedicated to advancing women's rights across America. As vice president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association [NAWSA], she served with Susan B. Anthony in 1888. During her term as president of NAWSA from 1904 to 1916, Anna increased the number of suffrage workers from about 17,000 to over 200,000. She lived long enough to see the favorable vote in Congress on the 19th amendment, but unfortunately, Anna died in 1919 before the 19th amendment was ratified in 1920.

During the celebration of the 200th birthday of our country's Constitution, the Michigan Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution is honoring Anna Howard Shaw with a bronze monument to be placed in her home town of Big Rapids, MI. The statue will be located in the park adjacent to the community library in Big Rapids.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me today in commending the Mecosta County Council for the Arts and the Mecosta County Women's Historical Council for their efforts to memorialize one of the great citizens in Michigan, Anna Howard Shaw. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the House, to join me in honoring Anna Howard Shaw for her accomplishments as a women's rights leader, her work in medicine, and her dedication to religion. Anna Howard Shaw's life

changed the course of history for every citizen in the United States today. We should all commend her for her outstanding accomplishments and her relentless dedication to the cause of women's rights.

SOVIET DAY OF SHAME

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, August 21, 1988, will mark the 20th anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. In 1968, over one-half million soldiers were sent by the Communists over the border of the peaceful nation of Czechoslovakia, determined to crush the reform-minded government of Alexander Dubcek, and to suppress efforts by the people of Czechoslovakia to obtain freedom and self-determination.

On this Soviet Day of Shame, the Communists blatantly violated the Czechoslovakia-Soviet Treaty of Noninterference. Once again, the Soviets demonstrated to the world that they are committed to stop any attempts by individuals to assert their inherent rights of liberty and self-expression.

Although the Soviets called this move a temporary occupation, today there is still a permanent presence of the Soviet Army in Czechoslovakia. If General Secretary Gorbachev truly intends to usher in a new openness under his policies of glasnost and perestroika, he should immediately order the withdrawal of all troops from Czechoslovakia. Instead, the activities of human rights groups, like Charter 77, and petitions of Catholics in Czechoslovakia remain ignored, and the suppression and persecution of Czechoslovakia continues.

We, in Congress, must continue in our efforts to persuade the Soviet Union to withdraw from their illegal occupation of Czechoslovakia and to abide by the commitments it has made as a cosponsor of the Helsinki Final Act and other human rights agreements.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia, I join with Americans of Czechoslovakian descent in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and throughout our Nation, as they commemorate this Soviet Day of Shame. Let us renew our strong commitment to the rights of the Czechoslovakian people in their efforts to determine the course of their own destiny, free from the yoke of Communist oppression and tyranny.

DEDICATION OF THE NINE MILE POINT UNIT TWO POWERPLANT

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had the privilege of being present at the dedication of the Nine Mile Point Unit Two Nuclear Power Plant in Scriba, NY. After years of plan-

ning and construction, the combined efforts of all parties involved finally came to fruition in March.

In reviewing the work that lead to the successful completion of Nine Mile Two, my good friend William J. Donlon, the chairman and chief executive officer of Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., made several interesting comments that I would like to share with my colleagues in the House.

The plant's completion was a formidable accomplishment for the people of Niagara Mohawk and our colleagues at New York State Electric and Gas, Long Island Lighting Co., Rochester Gas and Electric and Central Hudson Gas and Electric.

We wouldn't be here today if it weren't for the backing of our co-tenants, the dedication of our people and the encouragement we've received over the years from the Community of Oswego County.

In a very real way, we have all been involved in a partnership these many years. Our employees and their families have made many sacrifices to support round-the-clock, seven-day-a-week construction at Nine Mile Two. Our co-tenants have been with us all the way.

The Oswego County Community has my heartfelt and personal gratitude and the appreciation of every Niagara Mohawk Employee. It could have been a different story without you. And I mean all of you—our employees, our co-tenants and this community. This country is littered with the tombstones of nuclear power plants that will never generate a kilowatt hour of our power.

But that's not happening here. Through dedication, perseverance and the strength of our partnership, you see to the north of us a functioning plant.

Nine Mile Two is a work of art in many ways and a testament to the sophistication and complexities of advanced power technology.

It is an entirely safe, environmentally sound and useful asset for its owners and the customers it will serve. It can generate enough electricity to supply the annual needs of six cities the size of Syracuse or Albany.

Through the use of nuclear power, Nine Mile Two has the capability of replacing six to eight million barrels of oil each year. That's significant when you consider that New York is a relatively oil dependent state.

Last year, oil accounted for 22 percent of the power generation capability in New York compared with a national average of less than five percent.

Furthermore, we have brought Nine Mile Two into service at a time when economic revitalization in Upstate New York is boosting energy use well beyond the most optimistic forecasts of recent years.

Consider what this new demand would cost over the next several decades if we were forced to increase our dependence on uncertain and expensive supplies of foreign oil.

As I reflect on it, these are all good reasons for a celebration. The commercial operation of Nine Mile Two is a victory for Niagara Mohawk and its co-tenants, for our people who worked hard and long to make it a reality and for our customers who can be assured many productive years of service from this new plant.

But I believe this should be a thoughtful occasion as well.

Nine Mile Two was a hard-won victory. The environment for planning and building

a major power plant—particularly a nuclear power plant—changed drastically during the years that we worked to bring this one to completion.

The energy demand scenario changed as well. Industry growth projections gave way in the 1970's and early 80's to the overriding importance of energy conservation and fluctuating growth in the U.S. economy.

Today's dedication marks a new era for Niagara Mohawk and at least a turning point for the other utilities assembled here today. We have a fine, new and productive plant that we can be proud of. We are dedicated to managing it in a manner that will contribute to the standards for excellence in the nuclear industry.

**IN APPRECIATION: PAUL SMITH,
DEPARTING ENERGY AND
COMMERCE MINORITY STAFF
DIRECTOR AND CHIEF COUNSEL**

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure many of my colleagues would agree, that, as Members of Congress, we rely to a significant degree upon our top-notch personal and committee staff people for information, advice, and counsel. In short, they are the hardworking men and women who keep the legislative branch of our Government functioning smoothly and effectively.

Today, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the outstanding contributions of a long-time congressional employee, Paul Smith, who has been employed by Congress for more than 16 years. Since February 1988, Paul has served as Republican staff director and chief counsel for the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Paul's legislative and legal experience is considerable. Prior to being appointed to this position, he was an associate minority counsel for the Energy and Commerce Committee, specializing in communications and securities. Before joining the committee staff, Paul served as an assistant counsel in the House of Representatives Office of Legislative Counsel. Currently, he is also an associate professor of law at the George Washington University National Law Center.

Time and again, Paul proved his expertise as a master of the legislative process, and as the committee's ranking minority member, I looked to him often for strategic political and legislative counsel. On several occasions, the minority depended on Paul's parliamentary prowess during very close floor battles and, to our great pleasure and satisfaction, we emerged victorious. Without question, the position of staff director and chief counsel is a very demanding job, and Paul performed his duties with distinction.

Paul will be leaving Congress to become a partner with the distinguished law firm of Wiley, Rein, & Fielding in Washington, DC, and those of us who knew Paul and worked with him will miss him greatly. On behalf of my colleagues on the committee as well as the

staff, I'd like to extend my personal appreciation to Paul for his many years of loyal and dedicated service to our Government and its people. I wish him many years of happiness and much success in his new endeavor.

SECOND ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL CATFISH DINNER

HON. MIKE ESPY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again seeking congressional recognition of the farm-raised catfish industry. Just last year, I appeared before this body to thank 220 of my colleagues who joined me in support of House Joint Resolution 178, a resolution which designated June 25, 1987, as "National Catfish Day"; a special day that recognized a new and developing industry in our country.

In its 17-year history, the farm-raised catfish industry has enjoyed phenomenal growth, from 5.7 million pounds in 1970 to 246 million pounds in 1987. The future of the farm-raised catfish industry continues bright.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for the other Members of Congress who enjoy the economic benefits of this industry when we say that the growing enthusiasm and demand indicate that this tasty and nutritious product will be an ever-increasing and stably priced source of protein for today's health-minded consumer.

Therefore, the farm-raised catfish industry of America joins us in seeking recognition of its importance by remembering National Catfish Day with the Second Annual Congressional Catfish Dinner on Tuesday, September 13, 1988, in Washington, DC.

Representatives joining me are:

Claude Harris, Jerry Huckaby, Wes Watkins, Bill Emerson, Jamie Whitten, Herbert (Sonny) Callahan, Clyde Holloway, John Lewis, G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Trent Lott, James Hayes, Tommy Robinson, Charles Hatcher, Wayne Dowdy, Bill Alexander, Tom Bevill, Richard Baker, Doug Barnard, Jr., James McCrery, John Paul Hammerschmidt, William Dickinson, Ronnie Flippo, J. Roy Rowland, Ike Skelton, Ed Jenkins, Members of Congress.

HAITI'S NEEDS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 7 weeks have passed since the Haitian military seized direct power from President Leslie Manigat.

Through their actions since last November Haiti's military leadership has shown contempt for the Haitian people, for the Constitution to which they had pledged their support, and for the opinions of mankind.

The *raison d'être* of any military is to safeguard their people and nation. If Haiti's army leadership is to have the respect of the Haitian people, to enjoy the respect of any other military or even to merit self-respect it must

realize that the army's leadership itself is the single greatest threat to the safety and welfare of the Haitian people.

Haiti no longer can delay in coming to grips with the downward spiral of environmental degradation, population growth, and severe poverty. Haiti needs—desperately needs—an honest and effective government dedicated to reversing the legacy of the Duvalier years—a government enjoying the respect of the rest of the world—a government which would be a reliable partner of those throughout the world not only willing, but longing, to extend a helping hand to the Haitian people.

The leaders of Haiti's army have embarked on a policy which can only lead to disaster. Seemingly they have turned their backs on the political, economic, and social reforms essential to assuring a better future for Haiti's people. The army leadership, through its tolerance of drug trafficking, seems intent on making enemies of Haiti's friends.

If those who lead Haiti's army care about the future of their country they must pause to reflect on the course they have taken. Can they really expect to build a better future for Haiti by turning their back on the rest of the world?

Viewed from this distance the leadership of the Haitian army certainly seems to be heading down a road toward an abyss. But it is never too late to turn back. There are other paths into the future. A good beginning has been suggested—that a serious dialog about those alternative paths be held amongst all elements of Haitian society—including, especially, the army.

I hope the leaders of Haiti's army will stop, think, and decide to return to a course worthy of the successors of those Haitian soldiers whose struggle for liberty almost two centuries ago won the respect of all the world.

WHERE MILITARISM FLOURISHES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the past several years we've seen many events which signal improving relations between Communist countries and the rest of the world. With the signing of the INF Treaty, the rise of glasnost, and the recent development in Angola, one cannot help but yearn for the day when the United States and all democratic nations can become close friends with Communist nations that today threaten and suppress democratic institutions worldwide.

Although there are signs that Communist nations are becoming conciliatory, we must not allow recent events to blind us of the very nature of communism we fear most: their inherent militarism. A study by Ben Zycher, an economist with the Rand Corp., found that between 1966 and 1983 Communist countries allocated 50 percent more of their GNP to their military than did non-Marxist countries. These facts must not be overlooked, and should lead us to approach alleged Communist good intentions with caution and skepticism.

I respectfully submit an article by Doug Bandow entitled "Where Militarism Flourishes" that will further elaborate on this important issue.

[From the Washington Times, July 29, 1988]

WHERE MILITARISM FLOURISHES

(By Doug Bandow)

One of the great ironies of our times is the persistent attraction of communism to many American leftists. During the 1920s and 1930s, Josef Stalin's Soviet Union was viewed as the new utopia; then Mao's Chinese revolution was treated as the model for a better world.

The murderous behavior of these totalitarian states eventually became impossible to ignore, but that didn't stop visionaries on the left from successively looking at Vietnam and Cuba as political paradises. Alas, revelations of re-education camps and overflowing prisons soon followed.

Most recently the left has treated Nicaragua as the society of the future. But that dream is now collapsing amidst the Sandinistas' latest orgy of repression.

What has been perhaps most curious about the liberal flirtation with totalitarian revolutions is the tendency of peace activists to look at the Soviet Union and other communist states with rose-tinted glasses. For there is an unmistakable correlation between militarism and communism.

A new study by Ben Zycher, an economist with the Rand Corp., has found that communist states consistently spend more on arms than do other nations. For instance, between 1966 and 1983 non-Marxist countries devoted an average of 4.26 percent of their gross national product to the military; the burden in communist nations was more than 50 percent higher, 6.97 percent.

The disparity between some pairs of antagonists is even greater. The Soviet military receives 16.9 percent of that nation's GNP, compared to just 6.5 percent for the U.S. military. North Korea's arms burden is more than twice that of South Korea, 12.2 percent vs. 4.9 percent.

China devotes 13.3 percent of its GNP to the military; India's share is only 3.1 percent. The military consumed 16.9 percent of non-communist South Vietnam's GNP while communist Vietnam now spends 22.1 percent of its resources on arms.

Similarly, the average proportion of the population in the military is higher in communist states, 1.3 percent, than in non-communist ones, .8 percent. The Soviets have a larger proportion of their population under arms than does the United States, 1.6 percent compared to 1.2 percent.

The respective shares for North and South Korea are 3.3 percent and 1.7 percent. China has armed .4 percent of its population, while .3 percent of India's people are in uniform.

Countries that undergo a Marxist revolution usually dramatically expand their militaries. In Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau and Nicaragua arms spending has increased sharply under communist governments. The proportion of men under arms usually jumps as well.

Nicaragua is a particularly good example of communism's militarist tendencies. Anastasio Somoza's regime, though under siege from the Sandinistas, devoted just 1.9 percent of its GNP to the military and had only .3 percent of its population under arms. Those figures are now 7.6 percent and 1.4 percent, respectively.

Finally, though the democratic Western industrial nations have a higher level of technological development, communist regimes devote a greater proportion of their nations' capital stocks to the military. For instance, Marxist regimes have more jets and tanks compared to GNP, cars, and telephones. Specific pairings of nations—United States vs. Soviet Union, China vs. India, and North Korea vs. South Korea, among others—show a similar communist bias toward the military.

Why does Marxism militarize any society that it touches? One reason suggested by Mr. Zycher is that the "opportunity cost" of military expenditures is less in a communist nation, since their economies are so inefficient. In short, an additional dollar invested in the civilian economy will bring less of a return under Marxism than in a capitalist democracy.

However, a more important factor observed by Mr. Zycher is the very nature of communism. Without elections or economic development to generate internal support, Marxist regimes must rely more heavily on arms to stay in power. Moreover, military might is seen as a useful instrument to enforce "historical processes" through external subversion and aggression.

The foreign policy of the United States can rightly be faulted on a number of grounds—needlessly subsidizing wealthy democratic allies and wrongfully supporting thuggish autocratic states, for example. But Mr. Zycher's research demonstrates a fundamental difference between democratic Western states and communist nations that should impress even the left: the inherent militarism of communism.

(Doug Bandow, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, is a nationally syndicated columnist.)

IN SUPPORT OF A FEDERAL PROGRAM TO ASSIST STATES IN RESPONDING TO THE THREAT POSED BY EXPOSURE TO RADON

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Energy and Commerce favorably reported H.R. 2837, an amendment to the Toxic Substances Control Act, to assist States in responding to the threat to human health posed by exposure to radon. I would like to commend my colleagues Mr. LUKE, as well as Mr. WHITTAKER and the members of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Hazardous Materials for the bipartisan spirit in which this legislation was developed.

The bill is of particular importance to me since exposure to radon is a real concern for my constituents. High levels of radon have been found in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania creating both anxiety and confusion.

This bill, of which I am an original cosponsor, is a first step in providing the public with what is needed to adequately address this problem. I believe the citizens of this country will best be served by a Federal program that puts the technical expertise and the financial resources in the hands of State and local offi-

cials where exposures unique to an area and the individual needs of a community can be identified and acted upon. I commend Mr. LUKEN and the members of his subcommittee for submitting a bill that puts the Federal role for radon abatement in the proper perspective.

Although this bill will provide the necessary technical and financial resources to the States, our efforts should not stop here. I firmly believe that the Federal Government and the scientific community should continue to update the risk assessment figures that we are currently using. The full extent of the problem is not yet assessed and dose-response levels are still undetermined. Knowledge about radon exposure and its health effects seems to be evolving by trial and error. All we know for certain is that prolonged exposure to high levels of radon can cause lung cancer. This conclusion is based on two occupational mining studies that are 30 to 40 years old. We are not exposed to the levels that miners were in the 1950's. We are exposed to radon in our homes and schools at levels considerably lower than those documented in the mining studies. What is the relationship between the occupational exposures and those that we are recording in our homes? Do we have enough data to adequately characterize risk from low dose exposure? I don't know. We don't know but we need to find out!

I am not suggesting these past studies are invalid or that we shouldn't use them to characterize the risk from radon—they are all we've got. I am suggesting, however, that we take a serious look at and build on the new data being developed by the EPA (under section 403 of SARA), the study recently released by the National Research Council and the work being done in Pennsylvania which will contribute to our understanding of the health risks associated with radon exposure in homes—and then decide if a course correction in our program is required.

With safety uppermost in our minds, we cannot wait for these studies to be completed before we go forward with this legislation. That is not an option. Today we must proceed with this legislation and begin to provide the American public with the protection from radon exposure that is needed.

MARC AND EILEEN NASRALLAH

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, did you know that automobile accidents claim thousands of lives each year? Of course you do—that's old news. Did you know that auto accidents are the principal cause of death among people under 24 years of age? I'm sure that you are aware of this as well. Statistics have consistently proven these facts to be correct.

Statistics, however, can lie. When I use this word I don't mean that they misrepresent the facts or alter the truth. What I mean is that sometimes they can oversimplify things. Yes, it is true that thousands die each year in car wrecks, and of these a hefty percentage are

young people. However, there is no way that these cold facts can describe the horror, anguish, grief, and pain that are the result of one automobile mishap. The story behind each automobile wreck, whether there are 1 or 50,000 deaths in a year, is an original tale, one which has little to do with graphs or numbers on a printed page.

I was unfortunately reminded of these facts recently after two of my constituents, a mother and her young son, lost their lives in a horrible accident on August 5. Mrs. Eileen Nasrallah and her 13-year-old son Marc were killed after a dump truck which had apparently undergone brake failure flew through a traffic light and flipped on top of their automobile. The car exploded into flames, preventing rescue workers from even getting close to the trapped victims.

Both mother and son were widely respected and adored by all those whose lives they touched. In fact, there are hundreds of people in my district who could better eulogize them than I. However, that is not my sole purpose here. I want people to think about these two souls and to remember them the next time they read statistics in the paper or hear them on TV. If the fact that two people could die through no fault of their own in a traffic mishap and leave an empty void in the hearts of all who knew and loved them can convince one unsafe driver to drive safely, more lives may be spared. Statistics have always indicated this problem, yet they have not caused many careless people to change their ways. Perhaps a human story might be more successful to this end than a list of numbers.

Eileen Nasrallah was a deeply religious woman who studied the Bible with zeal and enthusiasm. She held Bible classes in her home and was always willing to give advice to troubled friends. On the day after her death her husband found a letter she had written to one of her Bible classmates. In it she said that, "Life on Earth is very brief compared to the afterlife," and that she looked forward to the day in which she could rejoice with God in Heaven. Perhaps God looked forward to that day as much as she did.

Marc Nasrallah loved nature and hummingbirds. He sang in St. Paul's Choir of Men and Boys and was head chorister as well. He was an honest, easy-going boy who got along with everyone. He had not accomplished all that he might have in his short life because he simply did not have enough time. The fact that he had the ability to be a success is a fact disputed by no one.

Their funeral was attended by hundreds of people whose lives had been brightened for having known Marc and Eileen. They cried and hugged one another and tried to give back to the Nasrallahs a small piece of what had been given to them. Their lives will certainly shine a bit less brightly than they did when Marc and Eileen were here, yet those lives will certainly shine more brightly than they would have if they had never been their friends.

Marc and Eileen Nasrallah left behind a legacy of hope and love for their God. To forget what they lived for and to remember them merely as a pair of decimal places in some mathematical equation is to do their memories a grave injustice. After all, to forget

how someone lived is the same as asking ourselves why should we mourn when they die. Indeed the story of a forgotten life or a neglected memory is the saddest tale that anyone can tell.

I know, however, that Marc and Eileen Nasrallah won't be forgotten.

A TRIBUTE TO THE SACRED HEART ACADEMY

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Sacred Heart Academy of Mount Pleasant, MI, as they enter their 100th year of instruction this month.

The long and distinguished history of the academy dates back to 1870, when a small group of Irish Catholic families migrated to central Michigan from Canada. As they settled in Mount Pleasant and found work, they soon felt the need for a parish to care for their communities spiritual needs. In the meantime, some of these devout families met together in their homes for prayer on Sunday afternoons.

Later that year, priests from nearby Saginaw Valley began making occasional visits to Mount Pleasant. In 1872, 3 acres in southwest Mount Pleasant were donated to the Detroit Diocese for the purpose of constructing a church. By 1875, enough money had been raised for actual construction, and work soon commenced.

In 1879 the church was completed and Father John J. McCarthy became its first resident priest. By 1888, the congregation had outgrown the first church and work began on a new building. At the same time, planning began for a Catholic school which would occupy the old church building.

In 1889, the Church of Most Sacred Heart of Jesus was officially opened. On August 30 of that same year, the Sacred Heart Academy began instruction. Over the course of the past 99 years, the academy has been enlarged several times to meet the needs of its steadily growing enrollment. Today the school accommodates nearly 1,000 students with a curriculum that includes both elementary and high school coursework.

Such rapid expansion has been possible only with the dedication, commitment, and generous spiritual and financial contributions of the members of the Sacred Heart Church. The same spirit of faith and commitment of those early Irish Catholic settlers lives on today in the hearts of the current Sacred Heart members. They are proof that the church and school reside on a foundation much stronger than just stone and mortar; that foundation is the spirit and dedication of the congregation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in extending heartfelt congratulations to the people of the Sacred Heart Academy as it begins its 100th year of instruction and service to the community. I wish them much success and prosperity this year, and in the many years that will follow.

LANE AND DORA GRAVES— OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Lane and Dora Graves of Vinton County, OH.

Because of their willingness to give of their time and energy to the people of their community, Lane and Dora Graves have been nominated by the Vinton County Senior Citizens Center for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizens Award.

Lane and Dora have worked diligently for the senior citizens center and its patrons. They have served as volunteers for the center for several years. Lane and Dora have always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of the center's efforts and local activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Lane and Dora's family and all of their many friends are proud of their outstanding achievements. It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to them for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that Lane and Dora will continue to share their good spirits with the people of Scioto County, and we wish them every success in their endeavors.

THE DEATH PENALTY LOTTERY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, when the House takes up the omnibus drug bill after the recess, we will be voting on the question of the death penalty. As my colleagues continue to consider this important question, I would like bring to their attention an editorial, written in 1985 by our colleague Congressman JOHN CONYERS of Michigan, which appeared in the New York Times.

The editorial raises a number of excellent points regarding the arbitrary and freakish application of the death penalty. I urge my colleagues to give his comments serious thought and consideration.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1985]

THE DEATH PENALTY LOTTERY

(By John Conyers, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Thirteen years ago this week, the Supreme Court, in a landmark decision, declared unconstitutional the "arbitrary and freakish" application of the death penalty. But in Virginia last week the execution of Morris Odell Mason, a mentally impaired black man with an I.Q. of 66, was determined by a death penalty system tantamount to a lottery in which life-and-death decisions depend largely on race, income or just bad luck.

Perhaps the least understood feature of the death penalty is its selectivity. Of the more than 35,000 people imprisoned for

murder, only 1,500—less than 3 percent—have been consigned to Death Row. Of the 20,000 homicides that may be committed this year, fewer than 150 people will be given the death sentence; of these, a much smaller fraction will be culled for the electric chair, gas chamber, firing squads or lethal injection.

The death penalty is determined largely by the countless vagaries of the criminal justice system; the inclinations and ambitions of the local prosecutor; the defendant's ability to pay for defense counsel; the skill or incompetence of the court-appointed defense attorney. Of the 37 states that use the death penalty, there are counties where juries almost always impose it, and counties where juries almost never do. There is a lengthy, unpredictable appeals process. Racial and economic discrimination are pervasive. The chances of being executed are from three to 10 times greater for killing a white person than a black person. And while date is yet to be collected on economic discrimination, more than 90 percent of those on Death Row could not afford to hire a lawyer at the time of their trial.

Most people, even the most ardent supporters of the death penalty, shudder at this freakishness in its application. Advocates argue, however, that disparities could be eliminated if like cases were treated in a like manner—if some capital offenders are executed, they should all be executed. Such proposals are socially and economically unfeasible.

There are 20,000 criminal homicides committed annually. Are we prepared for the specter of more than 80 executions every day, including Sundays and holidays, as such a "fair" policy would dictate? I think not. Not even in 18th and 19th century England, when the "Bloody Code" contained more than 250 capital offenses, were that many executions performed.

It is also questionable whether we have the legal machinery to bring about such carnage. Studies of the proposed death penalty statute in New York indicate that it costs the state some \$2 million (plus a large diversion of resources, time and talents) to successfully pursue a condemned person to death—many times more costly than imprisonment. How many laid-off police officers are worth one execution?

And as we begin to execute more and more defendants, the prospect of making the ultimate mistake becomes more certain. Michael L. Radelet, a criminologist at the University of Florida, already has identified more than 100 innocent individuals who were at one time condemned to die.

Decision-makers continue to hold up the electric chair as a symbol of their resolve to be "tough" on crime despite the total absence of persuasive evidence that it is a deterrent. Studies don't support deterrence, and states with no death penalty still generally have comparable or lower homicide rates. While the national homicide rate declined last year, it increased 5.1 percent in Florida, where the highest number of executions were performed.

Reliance on the death penalty is misleading and dangerous because it permits evasion of more fundamental, practical questions about violent crime: Why is the criminal homicide rate in America from two to 10 times greater than in Western European countries, where the death penalty has been abandoned? Why is there not more effective gun control? Why are there not more Federal and state resources devoted to law enforcement? Why is there no system whereby

capital offenders must provide restitution to the victim's family and to society?

The death penalty is as impractical, arbitrary and discriminatory as ever and is likely to remain so.

HELPING TO EXPAND ACCESS TO LONG-TERM HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1988

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am today introducing legislation to establish a new part C of the Medicare Program which will provide for a much-needed array of noninstitutional long-term care services for elderly and disabled Medicare beneficiaries.

The legislation, the Helping To Expand Access to Long-Term Health Care Act of 1988, or the Health Care Act, would provide a solid foundation upon which to base a truly comprehensive long-term care system for the elderly, as well as for other segments of our population who need long-term care including chronically ill and disabled children.

I am pleased to say that this measure is a companion to legislation introduced by Senator JOHN MELCHER, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Senator MELCHER and his able staff, particularly Chris Jennings, deserve a great deal of recognition for their fine efforts with this legislation.

Tomorrow afternoon, my friend and colleague, Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR, will join me in chairing a Seattle hearing of the Aging Committee's Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests, which I chair. This hearing, entitled "Long-Term Home Care: An Issue for Families in Crisis," will draw from the breadth of experience and expertise available in Washington State on the issue of long-term care for the elderly and disabled.

MARY ROSE OAKAR and I will learn a great deal tomorrow about the problems in providing long-term care, particularly at home, to the chronically ill and disabled of all ages. In addition to learning about the problems, Washingtonians will provide us with fresh insights and constructive recommendations regarding long-term care. Their observations will help to provide thoughtful guidance to all of us in Congress as the debate intensifies over the shape of a national long-term care policy that is sure to be produced by the 101st Congress.

It is my hope that the legislation that I am offering today—the Health Care Act—will play a significant role in furthering that debate. I believe that the Health Care Act builds upon and complements the outstanding efforts to tackle long-term care that have already occurred during the 100th Congress. Most notable among these, of course, is H.R. 3436, the Pepper-Roybal legislation to provide for long-term home care for the elderly, disabled adults, and children. I am proud to have cosponsored H.R. 3436 and know that Senator PEPPER—who turns 88 next month—will continue to be a powerful voice behind establish-

ing a long-term-care policy in the next Congress. Numerous congressional hearings have recently been held, or are planned, dealing with long-term care, and several major long-term care-related bills have been introduced. I hope that this bill and my subcommittee hearing tomorrow provide new insights and direction on this issue.

Before I outline the key features of the Health Care Act, Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss two aspects of long-term care coverage that my bill does not include. First, it does not include a nursing home benefit—its focus is home and community-based long-term care. That is not to suggest, however, that we should not reform our approaches to financing nursing home stays. On the contrary, this is a crucial area of long-term care that must be overhauled. I speak from personal experience on this point. My father resides in a nursing home and I am well acquainted with the extraordinary cost and complexities associated with that level of care which is so necessary for many older Americans. A national policy for long-term care must address financing nursing home care. This is a major challenge, however, and I intend to work to actively seek a realistic proposal that I can support.

Second, my bill addresses elderly and disabled Medicare beneficiaries. It does not include disabled and chronically ill children. I am fully committed to assisting families coping with the economic and emotional traumas associated with caring for chronically ill or severely disabled children. In fact, my hearing tomorrow includes testimony from the family of a severely disabled 14-year-old that is struggling to care for him at home. I expect that our hearing and other efforts currently underway in Congress will enable us to find a revenue source to appropriately finance this badly needed care. I believe that Congress must tackle this aspect of long-term care policy, along with the needs of non-Medicare eligible disabled adults, with the same vigor and thoughtfulness that we approach long-term care coverage under Medicare.

Senator PEPPER has laid out the challenge for us concerning long-term care for Americans of all ages. The structure created to provide the services envisioned under the Health Care Act can easily be modified to address the needs of children and others who would benefit from home care services. My legislation would provide a solid foundation for doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to touch upon several of the key features of the Health Care Act, this legislation will provide for a broad array of services to assist chronically ill and disabled Medicare beneficiaries, and, as importantly, their family members who provide, often at great cost—financial, physical, and emotional—support and care to their loved ones.

First, this bill will establish a new part C of Medicare to provide eligibility for those beneficiaries who require assistance with two or more activities of daily living [ADL's], such as bathing and toileting, as well as for those with cognitive impairments such as Alzheimer's or Parkinson's disease. These are very often the people who cannot obtain coverage for nursing home stays—even when they become impoverished and are Medicaid eligible. These

are people for whom a nursing home stay is frequently inappropriate. Moreover, given the choice, these disabled older Americans, like us, would generally prefer to remain at home with their loved ones, in a comfortable and familiar environment.

Second, the services that would be available are designed to address the diverse and serious needs that beneficiaries and their families face if they are to remain at home. In addition to home care services, an adult day care and respite care benefit would be established to enable working caregivers—typically a wife or daughter—to assist their loved one at home during the evenings and weekends. The respite care benefit would provide essential relief so that the caregiver can take care of other business, such as grocery shopping, or just to take a badly needed break, or, as one of my witnesses tomorrow will testify, to get a few hours sleep. Without such services, the result is all too often premature or unnecessary placement in a nursing home or other 24-hour care setting.

Third, my legislation calls for State administration of the new part C program. States would be provided a framework for designing their program but must meet a specified minimum set of services. This would give States autonomy in providing this program in a way that meets their particular needs and circumstances.

A major feature of the Health Care Act is that it rewards States that have shown innovation in and commitment to developing home and community-based long-term care systems. No State would have to finance more than 25 percent of the cost of the new long-term care program. A State that is funding long-term care services above the 25-percent level would then spend those additional funds for other health care priorities, such as providing coverage for the uninsured or maternal and child health programs. My home State of Washington has been a leader in this area, having invested substantial resources in developing their long-term care system and I am pleased to say that Washington will gain much-needed financial assistance and flexibility in meeting its health care needs.

Fourth, this new program would be financed by the combination of removing the current cap on the Medicare payroll tax, and beneficiary copayments. Therefore, the costs are shared by the general working population and by those who use the services. Home care services would be provided at a \$5 per visit copayment and adult day care would be provided for up to 125 days of care per year with a \$5 per day copayment. Those beneficiaries whose income is at or below 200 percent of the poverty level, however, would not be responsible for copayments for home and adult day care services. Revenue collected would be placed into a new "Federal Long-Term Care Assistance Trust Fund," designated as part C of the Medicare Program.

Fifth, a case management system would be used to ensure that beneficiaries receive the appropriate levels of care. Moreover, the case managers would be objective in that they could either be providers of services or have a proprietary interest in providing long-term care services.

Sixth, this legislation addresses the crucial issue of quality assurance. For example, the quality assurance provisions in place for Medicare home health agencies, refined under OBRA 87, would now apply to all entities providing noninstitutional services under this program. Also, States failing to comply with quality standards would face an increased share-of-cost for the program.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, this program would recognize the need for States to set up the necessary administrative structures prior to full implementation. Funds collected through elimination of the payroll tax cap would be used to not only build up reserves for financing the new benefits, but to provide startup costs to all 50 States. In 1989, the Secretary could distribute up to \$1 billion, but not less than \$0.5 billion, to assist all States in gearing up for this program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an important piece of legislation. It is well-crafted and recognizes the innovation and the practical experience in designing and implementing home and community-based long-term care services that is taking place in the States. Moreover, the Health Care Act reflects what the public wants. As a recent poll by Louis Harris and other major polls have demonstrated, the American public, by an overwhelming majority, believes we need to meet the long-term care needs of Americans and that Government must provide the leadership for this. Most Americans prefer to remain at home as long as they can—this legislation will help to make this a realistic option for Medicare beneficiaries.

We are clearly on our way to establishing a National policy for long-term care. This legislation provides a realistic approach to setting that policy and forming a foundation upon which to add nursing home care coverage reform and to meet the long-term care needs of children and others. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of the Health Care Act as we gear up for our efforts in the 101st Congress to provide relief to American families for the catastrophic costs and trauma of chronic illness and severe disabilities.

THE PANAMA CANAL DEAL, PLUS 10

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Phyllis Schlafly, entitled, "The Panama Canal Deal, Plus 10."

As each year passes, it becomes evident that the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 should never have been ratified by the Senate in 1978. Each Senator, among them LLOYD BENTSEN, who voted to ratify the treaty must deeply regret their unpopular vote on this controversial topic.

The United States never had to give back our canal to Panama as the country never had any claim whatsoever to the territory. The 1903 treaty gave the United States exclusive

use, occupation, and control of the Canal Zone. Most importantly, this grant of sovereignty was given to us in perpetuity; it was not leased nor rented.

Supporters of the treaty's ratification argued that the canal would lose its strategic importance both militarily and economically. The conditions that existed and were predicted 10 years ago which prompted the treaty have never occurred. Shipping on the canal has increased rather than decreased. Instead of becoming obsolete, the canal has never been more of an integral part of our economy and military operations.

A decade later, what remains of the folly of 1978 is a foreign policy disaster. A treaty which was thought would ingratiate the United States with Panama and the rest of Latin America has failed miserably, and consequently, our relations with Panama and General Noriega have never been worse.

My colleagues, "The Panama Canal Deal, Plus 10," from the Washington Times is yet another article on Panama which will further support my proposal, House Concurrent Resolution 354, to express a sense of Congress to abrogate the Panama Treaties. Now is the time to rectify a situation which has been degenerating since ratification by abolishing the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 8, 1988]

THE PANAMA CANAL DEAL, PLUS 10
(By Phyllis Schlafly)

Lloyd Bensten has a skeleton in his political closet that is much worse than his disagreements with Michael Dukakis on social and defense issues. Mr. Bensten is one of a handful of senators still in office who voted in 1978 to give away the U.S. canal in Panama.

Other issue positions can be fuzzied up. Politicians can change their minds, or express regret for earlier mistakes. But giving away the Panama Canal is one controversial Senate vote that is carved in granite; time can never erase the black mark on every senator who participated in that shameful deal.

With the U.S.-Panama Treaty signed by President Jimmy Carter on Sept. 7, 1977, and ratified by the Senate by one vote on April 18, 1978, the United States agreed to turn over our canal to Panama in the year 1999. That decision was vastly unpopular then, and it has been proven tragically wrong by subsequent events.

The Panamanian dictator to whom the Senate gave our canal was cut from the same cloth as today's bad man, Gen. Manuel Noriega. Omar Torrijos seized power in 1968, threw out his own constitution, and then compiled the worst record on human rights in all Latin America. According to Freedom House, Panama was then specifically rated as "NF," which stands for "Not a Free Country." The anti-American, procommunist, drug-peddling Torrijos handpicked Gen. Noriega as his successor.

In the 1970s, many Americans were falsely led to believe that we should have some kind of guilt complex about owning the canal and that we should "give back" our canal to Panama in order to guarantee good relations with Panama and Latin America.

In truth, Panama had no claim whatsoever to the canal; the U.S. taxpayers

bought, built and generously paid for the canal to the tune of \$7 billion. Since we gave Panama our canal, our relationship has sunk to the lowest level in history.

Under the terms of a 1903 treaty, Panama granted us the exclusive use, occupation and control of the Canal Zone and all rights, power and authority as if we were sovereign "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." The length of this grant of sovereignty to us was "in perpetuity"; those words "in perpetuity" appear seven times in the 1903 treaty.

Panama did not lease us the zone. The term "grant" was used 14 times in the treaty; the term "rent" or "lease" does not appear even once.

All we received was a little piece of land, 10 miles wide by 50 miles long, pest-ridden, mosquito-infested and uninhabitable. No one in the history of the world ever was so greatly enriched for such a then-worthless piece of real estate.

First, the Panamanians got our guarantee of their independence. Panama had unsuccessfully revolted 50 times against Colombia during the preceding 70 years. By the 1903 treaty, the powerful United States pledged to guarantee the independence of this little country.

Second, Panama got the promise that we would build our canal in Panama instead of Nicaragua, which is closer to our country, has a more favorable climate, and has better geographic conditions.

Third, Panama got more cash than we paid for any land in all our history; more, for example, than we paid for Alaska.

Fourth, we cleaned up Panama. We spent two years wiping out malaria, yellow fever and the rats that carried the bubonic plague. We made it a healthful place to live. Finally, we poured in a tremendous investment which gave Panama the highest standard of living in Central America and the fourth-highest in Latin America.

All the talk we hear about moving toward "democracy" in Panama is ridiculous. In the 74 years preceding the canal giveaway treaty in 1978, Panama had 59 chiefs of state. Since World War II, Panama has had 13 changes of government, five of them violent.

The polls showed that 80 percent of Americans opposed the canal giveaway. So why did the Senate do it? The big push came from the 10 largest banks that had loaned a total of \$2.9 billion to Panama. The Torrijos regime was broke and its credit was gone, so the banks didn't have a chance of collecting their bad loans unless Panama somehow got access to the tolls from the canal.

Now, 10 years later, our canal is hostage to another anti-American, procommunist, drug-peddling dictator. It was all so predictable.

Lloyd Bensten and the other senators who voted for this giveaway either have no competence in foreign affairs, or they were paties for the 10 biggest banks that wanted to protect their bad loans at the expense of U.S. security and the wishes of the American people.

Either way, Mr. Bensten is an embarrassment to the Democratic ticket.

**STARLEY GUSTIN—
OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZEN**

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Starley Gustin of West Union, OH.

Because of his willingness to give of his time and energy to the people of his community, Starley Gustin has been selected by the Adams County Senior Citizens Council for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Starley has worked diligently for the Senior Citizens Center and its patrons. He has served 12 years as a local school board member and 16 years as an Adams County Commissioner. Additionally, Starley was instrumental in the organization of the Adams County Senior Citizens Council. During his tenure in public office, the commissioners built and designated five community buildings which has supplied the much-needed space for senior citizens and others. Moreover, he has always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of the center's efforts and local activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Starley's wife, Mary, and his children, Dennis, Beverly, and Elaine, and all of his many friends are proud of Starley's achievements. It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Starley and his family for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that he will continue to share his good spirits with the people of Adams County, and we wish him every success in his endeavors.

**HAL FREEMAN—A LEGACY OF
HONOR AND PRINCIPLE IN
THE BATTLE FOR CIVIL
RIGHTS IN AMERICA**

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today about the passing of a fine American and a courageous civil servant, Hal Freeman, the former HHS regional manager who succumbed on Saturday, July 30, 1988. Hal Freeman was a man of deep principle who served with honor and distinction in the Federal service having resigned in 1986 when he was unable to persuade his Director of the urgency and need to prepare the Department of Health and Human Services to address high probability of resultant discrimination from the ravaging AIDS epidemic—then in its fifth year of a public health crisis.

I can remember his steady, unemotional testimony before a committee in Congress, and I was deeply impressed with Mr. Freeman's commitment to civil rights enforcement and of doing what was right in his mind. He had written a factual yet moving letter of res-

ignation framing the issues of discrimination clearly falling on these new victims of hysteria and fear—individuals with AIDS or those who may have been infected with the HIV. Together with his professional commitment to civil rights and his 20 years of arduous service to his Government, Hal Freeman contributed much to all of us whether we were blacks who were denied hospital services; the disabled unable to secure physical access to buildings or to programs; or to those of us who were language minorities unable to learn without support services. Hal Freeman had indeed fought the good battles, developed and challenged a dedicated civil rights staff, and worked in the trenches to beat down the doors of bigotry, ignorance, and even benign neglect.

While the illustrious figures of Martin Luther King and other prominent public figures of the civil rights movement may well be known to all of us, the day-to-day substance of implementing civil rights surely lie with the Hal Freemans of our world. It is his lifelong contributions to making America live up to its principles and laboring in the vineyards of civil rights that we salute Hal Freeman for helping each of us realize those principles of equality and equitable treatment, and who thereby enlarged our humanity. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I wish to insert into the RECORD my words spoken 2 years ago as well as the letter of resignation of Hal Freeman which follow below:

[From the Congressional Record, Aug. 6, 1986]

STATEMENT IN PRAISE OF HAL FREEMAN, FORMER REGIONAL MANAGER FOR THE OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL OFFICE

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, an obscure article appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, February 23, 1986, announcing the resignation of the Department of Health and Human Services' Regional Manager of the Office of Civil Rights. Ordinarily, such an event would not have aroused public interest, however, the circumstances of this resignation, and the principles enunciated in the accompanying letter of resignation have raised this public act to one of profound implication, not only because it would impact on the public discussion concerning the protection of all Americans who may become victims of AIDS or who may contract this deadly virus and have to fight for their lives, but also because ensuing public concern would focus on enforcement of our civil rights laws. Mr. Speaker, I am publishing this moving letter of resignation of Hal Freeman because it eloquently speaks about this courageous civil servant who dared to fight to change the system from within and who resigned on principle when he failed to move his Director. I am certain that when Members read this letter, they will surely join with me in public praise of this young man of conscience and conviction.

Now about Hal Freeman: Born in Oklahoma City in 1936, Hal Freeman has had a distinguished career in public service. Having graduated from Northwestern University in Evanston, IL with a B.S. in sociology in 1957, Mr. Freeman earned a masters degree in clinical psychology in 1984 in broadening his education. Hal served with the Chicago Commission on Human Relations rising to

become its director of Housing and Community Services by 1962. Then in 1968 he came to the Department of Health and Human Services' Office for Civil Rights, where he became director after over 18 years of dedicated service at the San Francisco regional office. He has had a most accomplished period of civil rights advocacy from 1968 to 1986.

Hal Freeman is an articulate and excellent individual who is also a compassionate and caring person. He has exemplified multiple skills and expertise in developing high standards for the regional office and has pursued excellence and high achievement throughout his Federal service career. In his services to his community, he has been a volunteer of good works; he served as a counselor at the Pacific Center for Human Rights Advocates and National Gay Growth; as a member of the National Gay Task Force, as well as a member of the American Civil Liberties Union and the Sierra Club and NAACP.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have a Californian of his high principles of conscience and the patience of his discipline come before our committee of Congress to express his thoughtful observations and experience in the conduct of civil rights enforcement in our Nation today. I commend to all Members reading of Hal Freeman's letter which follows below:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

San Francisco, CA, February 20, 1986.

Ms. BETTY LOU DOTSON,

Director, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. DOTSON: This letter is to confirm my resignation as Regional Manager of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Region IX, in protest over current OCR policy regarding discrimination against persons with AIDS, AIDS-related conditions, or persons who are perceived as having such a condition.

As you know, during four telephone conversations with you on February 7, 14, and 20, 1986, I discussed my objections to OCR policy, and I informed you on February 7th that I wanted to resign since I was unable to follow that policy in good conscience. On February 20th, after attempting to dissuade me from resigning, you finally accepted my resignation.

My objections to OCR policy regarding AIDS cases fall into the following five areas:

1. Whether persons with AIDS and AIDS-related conditions are considered "handicapped" within the meaning of Section 504.

Both the statute and our Department regulation define "handicapped person", in part, as "any person who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities . . ." The regulation defines "physical impairment" as "any physiological disorder or condition . . ." "Major life activities" are "functions such as caring for one's self, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and working." Appendix A. Analysis of Final Regulation, states that the definition of handicapped person "does not set forth a list of specific diseases and conditions that constitute physical or mental impairments because of the difficulty of ensuring the comprehensiveness of any such list."

Anyone diagnosed with AIDS, according to the Centers for Disease Control, has both a life-threatening curtailment of the immune system and an opportunistic infection such as Kaposi's sarcoma, a skin

cancer, or pneumocystis carinii pneumonia, medical disorders which clearly "substantially limit a major life activity." Therefore, it is inconceivable that someone with AIDS would not be considered "handicapped" within the meaning of Section 504. Moreover, Social Security Administration, a part of our Department, has ruled that AIDS is a disability, entitling AIDS patients to SSI disability benefits.

In the case of persons with AIDS-related conditions, OCR could state with certainty that any such condition that substantially limited a person's ability to perform a major life activity would be considered "handicapped" within the meaning of Section 504.

In our discussion of February 7, 1986, you insisted that we cannot consider persons with AIDS or AIDS-related conditions to be "handicapped" within the meaning of Section 504 because, unlike other medical conditions, we have "no track record" with AIDS. You further informed me that you have referred this issue to the Office of the General Counsel for a legal opinion and that, until one is developed, we are unable to advise anyone of our position with regard to the coverage of AIDS under Section 504.

Although it is true that we have no "track record" with AIDS cases, we have, since OCR began enforcement of Section 504 in 1977, a long history of considering various diseases and injuries, both temporary and permanent, as handicapping conditions. For example, complainants with allergies, sprained ankles, and even contagious diseases such as staph infections and Hansen's Disease (leprosy) have been found to be handicapped within the meaning of Section 504. Moreover, in 1985, the 11th Circuit found tuberculosis to be a handicapping condition under Section 504.

In our discussion on February 15th, attempting to demonstrate how impossible it would be to say that AIDS patients are handicapped persons, you referred to a news story that day about a school system that had readmitted a child with AIDS. You said "How could that child be handicapped if he was able to return to school." As I indicated to you on the phone, a child with diabetes or a mobility impairment who was able to attend school would still be considered "handicapped."

One of the points that you made with me on February 7th was that we could not say that every AIDS case would be covered by Section 504. You stated, "In OCR the complaint is always from the viewpoint of the eyes of the beholder" and that "we deal with each case within the four corners of what the case is." I certainly agree, as I stated to you. We must consider other factors in addition to a person's physical condition before assuming jurisdiction over any case, including one involving AIDS. It would be neither legally correct nor appropriate for OCR to say that all AIDS cases are covered by Section 504 or that all AIDS patients are "handicapped". But for OCR to carry out its legal mandate properly, we should admit that AIDS and AIDS-related conditions are physical handicaps covered by Section 504 and, depending on the circumstances of the particular case, OCR may or may not have jurisdiction or find that the law was violated. The burden is on OCR, however, to inform recipients, complainants and the general public that Section 504 may apply in an AIDS case. This issue is being discussed widely in law journals, such as the Spring 1985 issue of the University of Dayton Law Review, which was circulated within OCR in October 1985 by the Region-

al Manager in Region II. It is ludicrous for us still to be debating whether AIDS patients are "handicapped" or if Section 504 covers persons with AIDS; rather, we should move on to the more difficult question as to how we will decide if a person with AIDS is a "qualified handicapped person" within the meaning of Section 504 and other more complicated issues. To accomplish this, we should coordinate with two components of our Department, the Centers for Disease Control and the Public Health Service, both of which have issued guidelines and instructions regarding AIDS, including guidelines for health workers who treat AIDS patients.

2. Whether Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 applies to persons with AIDS or AIDS-related conditions.

Since anyone with AIDS or an AIDS-related condition unquestionably is physically handicapped (as discussed above), there is no question that Section 504 applies to them and protects them from certain forms of discrimination.

Over the years, OCR has cited numerous medical conditions, such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes, etc., that would cause a person to be considered "handicapped" within the meaning of Section 504 and therefore eligible for its protection. However, you told me on February 7th that OCR cannot say that Section 504 covers persons with AIDS or AIDS-related conditions. When I questioned you about this, you stated, "There is no reason to gratuitously come out and make an unqualified statement that all AIDS cases are covered under Section 504 because, in fact, they are not." I readily agreed and still agree with you that not all AIDS cases would be covered by Section 504, but AIDS, as a handicapping condition, would be covered, and for us to refuse to provide that information to the public is to fail our responsibility as a civil rights law enforcement agency and to fail to help establish national policy in this important new area.

3. Whether a person who is treated as if he/she had AIDS is covered by Section 504.

In December, 1985, OCR, Region IX, received a complaint from a person without AIDS who alleged that he was being harassed by co-workers who treated him as if he had AIDS. Your office stated 1) that this complaint did not fall under Section 504 since the complainant did not actually have AIDS and therefore could not be considered handicapped, and 2) the complainant probably was being harassed because he is homosexual. Your first argument does not take into account that one of the statutory and regulatory definitions of "handicapped person" is "any person . . . who is regarded as having such a (physical) impairment", meaning persons who have no physical or mental impairment but are treated by a recipient of Federal funds as if they are handicapped.

The allegation in the complaint cited above certainly feel within this definition of "handicapped person", but your office insisted incorrectly that a person must be at least "a little bit handicapped" to be "regarded as" handicapped. Moreover, before conducting an investigation, OCR should never impute motives to the alleged wrongdoers (such as assuming they are harassing the complainant because of his homosexuality) rather than their perception of him as a person with AIDS) without conducting OCR's obligatory investigation.

A large number of persons in groups that are at high risk for contracting AIDS are being subjected to discrimination because

they are thought to have AIDS or be "carriers" of AIDS. Alleged discrimination against people regarded as having AIDS should be investigated under the provisions of Section 504, contrary to the policy of your office.

4. What should be the process and timing of developing OCR's policy on AIDS?

In our discussion of February 7th, the only action that you cited towards development of OCR, policy regarding AIDS cases was your referral of the matter to the Office of the General Counsel for a legal opinion. Further, you said you did not know how long it would take for the policy to be issued.

This is in contrast to the "Baby Doe" activity which OCR was involved in a couple of years ago. Within weeks of the famous "Baby Doe" case in Indiana, and the President's mention of it in a press conference, OCR declared "handicapped infants" to be "handicapped" within the meaning of Section 504; developed policies and procedures immediately to apply to this new application of Section 504; held national meetings in a timely manner to train OCR staff, prepared manuals and other explanatory materials for distribution to all OCR staff; sent notification to all hospitals regarding their responsibility to comply with Section 504 requirements concerning handicapped infants; advertised and maintained a 24-hour hotline for the filing of complaints; arranged for onsite investigations to occur within 24 hours of the receipt of any complaint; etc.

Some of these actions were necessitated by the emergency nature of complaints of discrimination against handicapped infants. However, some of these procedures would also be appropriate in some instances of discriminatory medical treatment against AIDS patients. For example, on two occasions, the Mayor of San Francisco has accused other communities of "dumping" its AIDS cases on San Francisco's county hospital. These patients were in a seriously debilitated state and required emergency treatment upon arrival at San Francisco General Hospital.

These two cases also illustrate that discrimination against AIDS patients, both in terms of services as well as employment, is a real problem. The media frequently have described incidents of persons with AIDS and AIDS-related conditions losing their jobs, suffering other forms of employment discrimination, and being denied needed medical services. We are now five years into what the President calls the number one health crisis in America. OCR should have its policies and procedures developed on this issue and be ready to move promptly to handle complaints and provide information to the public on the consequences of illegal discrimination against persons with AIDS.

5. How OCR should carry out its technical assistance mandate with regard to AIDS.

One of the priorities of your administration has been called "preventive civil rights" or providing technical assistance to recipients and the public so as to achieve voluntary compliance with the statutes that are enforced by OCR. In fact, the only reference to OCR's work in the Department's FY 1987 Budget Statement is that we will continue to provide technical assistance so as "to encourage voluntary compliance by organizations receiving assistance from the Department, thereby avoiding or reducing the number of formal investigations or enforcement actions."

We are unable to carry out completely the mandate for technical assistance because your policy prevents our saying that a

person with AIDS is considered handicapped. Recently, for example, we received a call from a nursing home chain urgently seeking advice about action it could take concerning an employee who they thought had AIDS; because we were unable to say anything, the recipient may inadvertently violate the law. If the question had concerned any other medical condition, we would have been able to answer it.

CONCLUSION

On February 7th, you agreed with me that the few complaints and inquiries that OCR has thus far received is "only the tip of the iceberg." You stated that "that is why we need to proceed so cautiously." I disagree. That is why we need to move ahead boldly and expeditiously to deal with an issue that legitimately falls under our jurisdiction.

I am concerned that the decision to move "cautiously" is politically motivated and stems, in part, from prejudice towards gay people and the concomitant erroneous assumption that AIDS is a gay disease. For example, one of your special assistants told me, in reference to the AIDS complaint in Region IX, that it was "not a priority" and "should not command our resources." I understand also that you stated in a meeting discussing the Region IX AIDS complaint that you did not want "to lend an aura of dignity" to these cases.

These statements reflect a lack of sensitivity and awareness, particularly since AIDS is affecting racial and ethnic minorities in disproportionately high numbers. You may not be aware that in the United States, roughly four out of every ten people with AIDS are non-white; 25% of Americans with AIDS are Black; nearly 15% are Hispanic.

As it appears to me that this agency will not willingly assume its proper responsibility for enforcing the law on this important issue, I cannot in good conscience remain silent. It is clear to me that OCR will dodge this issue as long as possible and try to avoid taking jurisdiction over any case involving AIDS. I fear that our direction in this area of civil rights will be similar to that in other areas; as far as I know, OCR has not found a recipient of HHS funds in violation of any civil rights law for the last four to five years.

In our discussions over the past month, I attempted to persuade you of the importance of fashioning an effective public response to the issue of AIDS discrimination under Section 504 in a timely manner. When you "ordered" me to follow your policies, I agreed to do so, as long as I remained in my position. When I informed you that you left me with no choice but to resign, you attempted to dissuade me from doing so and asked me to reconsider my decision. We failed in our attempts to convince each other, and I regret that. I am sorry to leave the organization I have served for 18 years, but since my greater allegiance is to my conscience and to my commitment to eliminate bigotry in all its forms, I am forced to resign as Regional Manager of Region IX. I wish you and all of OCR the best of success in your endeavors, and please call on me in the future if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely,

HAL M. FREEMAN,
Regional Manager,
Office for Civil Rights, Region IX.

THE ANGOLA SETTLEMENT

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a good deal of diplomatic activity on the part of those governments involved in the violent struggle in southern Angola. Prospects for a negotiated settlement are improving, which could lead to a withdrawal of both Cuban and South African forces from the country and eventual independence for Namibia, the southwest African nation which South Africa rules illegally in defiance of United Nations Resolution 435 which calls for immediate withdrawal by South Africa, and free and fair elections for a new and indigenous government.

Since the Congress has allocated funds to support the Angola terrorist group, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA], we have a responsibility to monitor progress toward an overall peace settlement. I encourage my colleagues to read an article that I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which analyzes development in the Angolan conflict. The article first appeared in the August 3 issue of the Washington Report on the Hemisphere, a biweekly publication of the Washington-based Council on Hemispheric Affairs [COHA], a policy and research organization. The author of the article is Alexander Bon, a research associate with COHA.

FRAMEWORK FOR ANGOLA SETTLEMENT
ENDORSED

(By Alexander Bon)

Cuba, Angola and South Africa have ratified a framework of 14 principles for settling the 13-year-old war in Angola and ending of South Africa's occupation of Namibia and the presence of Cuban military forces in the region. The agreement accepts United Nations Resolution 435, which calls for the withdrawal of South African troops from the trust territory which they illegally occupy and for U.N.-supervised elections in that nation. Both Angola and South Africa have agreed "to cooperate with the [U.N.] Secretary General and with a view toward insuring independence of Namibia." The agreement also calls for "redeployment towards the north and the staged and total withdrawal of Cuban troops" from Angola.

On July 22-23, Angola, South Africa and Cuba met in Cape Verde to discuss military matters. The key question of the pace of mutual troop withdrawals will be tackled in future negotiating rounds, with the next session set for August 2 in Geneva.

The U.S.-armed and backed guerrilla group, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), has not been a participant in the Washington-sponsored negotiations. A State Department spokesman said the White House will continue sending military aid to UNITA until an internal political compromise is reached which includes a role for UNITA and its leader, Jonas Savimbi. U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Chester A. Crocker, who is mediating the talks, urged Angola to open channels with Savimbi on the "separate but very important issue of national reconciliation."

UNITA is not covered by the agreement, which has prompted Savimbi to propose a form of cooperation with the Angolan government in which the present leaders of Angola would remain and Savimbi himself will not ask for a cabinet post.

UNITA's position has now become potentially vulnerable because South Africa's military support for Savimbi would have to terminate under the accord, leaving UNITA at the mercy of a better equipped and trained Angolan army.

At the most recent talks in New York, Cuba offered to withdraw its troops from the Namibian border 15 days after a U.N. peacekeeping force takes up positions there. Over the next 7 months, South Africa would pull out its troops from Namibia, and Cuba would then begin withdrawing its troops from Angola, pulling out 20,000 troops in two years, and the remainder over four years.

The reasons for the delayed Cuban pull-out may be partially economic. To integrate 50,000 young men into the Cuban economy over a short period might pose insurmountable difficulties. However, analysts consulted by the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) said the prime reason behind Cuba's proposed slow rate of withdrawal is probably its mistrust of South Africa's intentions. Pretoria demanded that the Cuban pullout take place within the same 11-month period that was planned for its own withdrawal, and not over a period of four years. For this reason, a spokesman at the South African embassy said the present Angolan-Cuban plan is not acceptable.

South Africa has suffered a series of recent military setbacks in southern Angola and white South African casualties are mounting, prompting growing domestic criticism.

In May, Cuba sent an additional 13,000 troops to Angola, bringing the total number of its forces in that country to more than 50,000. Because of a string of recent victories by combined Angolan-Cuban forces, the military situation in Angola has changed in Havana's favor. Moreover, the setbacks suffered by the powerful South African army have enhanced Cuba's prestige in the region.

Although Reagan and Gorbachev declared at their Moscow summit that September 29, 1988—the tenth anniversary of the signing of U.N. Resolution 435—would be the target date for reaching a final agreement on the Angola-Namibia conflict, the Soviets do not appear to be pressuring the Cubans to withdraw their troops at a faster rate than Havana seems willing to do.

Future talks must address the difficult question of the timetable for the repatriation of both South African and Cuban troops. Nevertheless all parties involved are optimistic over the acceptance in New York of the basic principles underlying the withdrawal of foreign troops from Angola and the granting of independence to Namibia. This optimism portend a better atmosphere in which the two sides could jump whatever hurdles remain.

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to add my comments to those of a

number of my colleagues who have expressed their concern about Soviet Jewry and the plight of Soviet refuseniks.

The small number of synagogues and the extremely limited availability of religious instruction within the Soviet Union underscore the fact that the needs of Jews simply are not being met under present conditions. Added to these structural problems are widespread reports of ongoing anti-Semitism in a wide variety of circles which constantly frustrate the desires and ambitions of Jewish people.

Many of my constituents have dedicated uncounted hours to provide assistance to persons of the Jewish faith who are unable to exercise the complete freedom of religious expression that we enjoy here in the United States. I have worked on behalf of several families myself and was pleased to be able to meet with Vladimir and Izolda Tufeld in Moscow in August of 1987. The Tufelds, longtime refuseniks, have a number of friends and supporters in my district in Kansas City and were very appreciative of the assistance that I was able to offer them.

During this trip I also had the opportunity to meet with First Deputy Chairman Pyotr N. Demichev, the head of Soviet emigration policy. During our conversation I stressed my strong interest in the plight of refuseniks and tried to impress upon Mr. Demichev the idea that this was a concern widely shared by many of my colleagues and millions of Americans.

In addition to the tragedy of unfulfilled religious desires is the distress that goes along with the widespread separation of families who try to emigrate. All of us have heard of the intense personal sacrifices that so many families have suffered through as part of the process of attempting to leave the Soviet Union.

Recent Soviet emigration statistics indicate an improvement in the treatment of Soviet Jews. An improvement in diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as between the Soviet Union and Israel, provides reason for optimism that conditions will continue to improve for Soviet Jews. But while there have been some improvements, far fewer Soviet Jews are allowed to emigrate today than during the peak emigration years in the late 1970's. Until full religious freedoms are granted to Soviet individuals regardless of their faith, we must continue to exert pressure on the Soviet Government for further progress on this issue.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the cochairs of this year's Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jews, Congresswoman CARLIS COLLINS and Congressman JOHN MILLER, for their leadership and hard work in helping to maintain the necessary high level of exposure for this issue. I would also like to thank the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews for their untiring efforts for continued progress in this area. It is only through our persistent efforts to assure religious freedom for Soviet Jews that we can continue to make progress on this important issue.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO
PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY
AND MEDICARE

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House of Representatives has passed H.R. 4478, the Deceptive Mailings Prevention Act of 1988. This legislation is urgently needed.

Dozens of groups and organizations have been formed with the sole intent of deceiving American citizens into making monetary contributions. Most of these groups have official-sounding names such as the "Social Security Protection Bureau," the "National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare," the "Federal Social Security Center," and the "Federal Record Service Corp." These types of groups unduly alarm people with misleading and false statements.

Coincidentally, since passage of this legislation, several of my Hoosier constituents have contacted my office regarding mailings they have received from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare continues to seek out senior citizens and requests a \$10 contribution based upon false and misleading statements contained in their numerous mailings. The national committee has a long history of misleading senior citizens into making monetary contributions.

The most recent mailing by the national committee offers a desk-top calculator to individuals who send a \$10 contribution and join its organization. However, this particular mailing also contains a so-called petition specifically printed with my name along with the two Senators from Indiana. Unfortunately, many people are confused by this petition and believe that the Members of Congress listed on the petition receive the money. Some also believe that taxpayer funds are used to pay for the "free calculator."

I call on the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare to stop its deceptive practices and return the money collected from elderly Americans. Using scare tactics against older people is outrageous and must be stopped immediately.

Groups and organizations that use the good name of the Social Security and Medicare Programs to take advantage of our citizens should take note. This Member of Congress will not sit idly by as unscrupulous groups use scare tactics to make people think that the Social Security System is unstable.

I urge all Americans to simply trash all mail you receive from this and the many other organizations that mislead people about the Social Security Program. I also urge the Senate to act on H.R. 4478, the Deceptive Mailings Prevention Act of 1988, as soon as possible.

H.R. 5241—BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE
ACT OF 1988

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H.R. 5241 the Biological Defense Act of 1988, with the aim of protecting the health and safety of American citizens and military personnel. The Biological Defense Act would transfer control of the Biological Defense Research Program to the Director of the National Institutes of Health, with the exception of activities which are purely military in nature. Only classified work and field testing of biological agents, which consists primarily of testing detection devices and protective clothing, would remain under Army control.

The Army's handling of the Biological Defense Program has recently come under severe fire. In May, I organized a hearing involving the chairman of the Interior, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs Committees, to evaluate the safety and policy objectives of the biological defense program. Since then several other hearings have been conducted as well. At each hearing, new and alarming revelations have emerged about the Army's handling of the Biological Defense Program.

I respect and share the Army's objective of protecting our soldiers from the threat of biological weapons. However, I also respect the necessity of protecting American citizens from the risks of biological research, some of which is highly dangerous.

There is a genuine need to ensure a proper balance between the needs of the military, and the welfare and safety of the general population; bringing most of the program under the civilian control of NIH will help guarantee that balance.

**HATE CRIMES AND RICO
REFORM**

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the deeply troubling subject of violence in our Nation. I also seek to place the issue of RICO reform in the context of violence in our society, particularly group sponsored violence. I realize, of course, that RICO is not the answer to violence, but its criminal and civil sanctions can play a role in curbing violence, and we ought not let any occasion pass to do what we can to curb violence.

The Scene: A courtroom in the State of Washington. Ten leaders and followers of a Neo-Nazi group, the "Aryan Nations," are charged with conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government. Such individuals are seldom taken seriously by the American press or public, but not among the members of the family of Denver talk show host, Allen Berg. Three of these neo-Nazis planned and carried out the machinegun slaying of Mr. Berg, a

Jew, outside his home, one calm, dark Denver night. Their motive: anti-Semitism.

II

Mr. Speaker, such violence against innocent people is neither a new nor a recent development in our history. As long as individuals have been angry or malcontent, groups have come together in small bands and engaged in such violent acts.

The Reconstruction period in our history illustrates my point. In the decade following the northern victory in 1865 in the Civil War and the freeing of slaves, a spate of laws were formed to guarantee the rights of the newly emancipated blacks. They included the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments and the various civil rights acts. But the promise of equality during Reconstruction was not to be realized. Ultimately, the farsighted reforms were defeated by southern white violence. With emancipation, a wave of murders swept the South, and Reconstruction soon became the bloodiest period of civil rights violence in our history. Militant groups, such as the white leagues and the Ku Klux Klan, organized to oppose the new challenge to white supremacy.

Outbursts of violence were commonplace throughout the South during this period.

According to Gen. Philip Sheridan, commander of troops in Louisiana and Texas during Reconstruction, 3,500 civil rights advocates were slain in Louisiana alone in the decade following the Civil War, 1,884 of them in 1868.

When blacks in Memphis, TN, appealed for their civil rights in 1866, rampaging whites burned homes and churches in the black section of that city and massacred 47 blacks.

The killing of 27 delegates by a white mob at the Louisiana State Convention in New Orleans in 1866 was little more than systematic massacre of blacks by whites.

Of 16 blacks elected as delegates to the Mississippi Constitutional Convention in 1868, 2 were assassinated by whites.

In the Alabama election campaign of 1870, four black civil rights leaders were murdered when they attended a Republican rally.

White racists took control of Meridian, MS, in 1871 after they killed a Republican judge and lynched an interracial group of civil rights leaders.

In the Mississippi election campaign of 1874, several black leaders in Vicksburg were attacked and murdered by members of the Ku Klux Klan.

During the Louisiana election campaign of 1878, Klan gunmen fired on blacks in Caddo Parish, killing between 40 and 75 people.

And so Reconstruction in the South was defeated by 1877, when the last of the black militia in the South were dissolved. Southern legislatures then adopted laws to deprive blacks of all opportunity for political or civil participation and to segregate all facilities for education, travel, and public accommodation, and mob violence and lynching occurred almost unchecked in the South until World War I.

In the 1890's, the legislatures of all Southern States disenfranchised black citizens. With its 1903 ruling in *Giles v. Harris* (109 U.S. 475), the Supreme Court, in effect, sanctioned this practice, when it suggested that 6,000 blacks, who had been denied registration, had

no judicial remedy and ought to apply for relief to the Congress or the President. A few years earlier, in 1896, the Court had also approved racial segregation, finding in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537), that "separate but equal" facilities were acceptable under the constitution.

As the black vote disappeared in the South, the assassinations of civil rights leaders decreased dramatically, only to be replaced by other forms of white violence: riots and lynching. Indeed, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was founded in 1909 to deal with just this sort of intimidation.

III

While small in actual numbers, the various organizations of far-right extremists today together compose the largest and most dangerous of the domestic American violence-prone organizations. Their tendency toward violence continues to increase even as recent Federal prosecutions aimed at the groups rise. In fact, we have seen more criminal violence by right-wing extremists during the past 3 years than over the previous two decades. (See "The Hate Movement Today" Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (1987)). At the same time, the Ku Klux Klan [KKK] membership has dropped 15 to 25 percent since 1984 to 4,500-5,500, and Neo-Nazis have suffered a similar shrinkage of 10 to 20 percent down to 400-450 members. (Id. at 1-2).

The largest of right-wing extremist groups operating within the United States is, of course, the Ku Klux Klan, which is actually not a single, consolidated organization, but composed of a myriad of regional and State-based hierarchies. The largest of the national Klan organizations are Knights of the KKK, Tusculumbia, AL; Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Shelton, CT; and the United Klans of America, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Currently, Klan membership totals 4,500-5,500, broken down roughly as follows:

United Klans of America ...	1,500
Invisible Empire, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan.....	1,500-2,000
Knights of the Ku Klux Klan (Tusculumbia faction).....	500-700
Southern National Front...	250-300
Christian Knights of the Ku Klux Klan.....	200-250

Unaffiliated Klan Organizations: Florida White Knights, Ohio Knights, Independent Order Knights (Maryland), Confederate Independent Order Knights (Maryland), New Order Knights (Missouri), Invisible Empire Knights (New Jersey), (California), Carmellia White Knights (Texas), Southern White Knights (Georgia)—300-450. (Id. at 4)

Since the Klan's revival efforts of the mid-1970's, its strength has been as follows:

1973	5,000
1975	6,500
1978	6,000-8,000
1979	9,000-10,500
1981	9,700-11,500
1982	8,000-10,000
1984	6,000-6,500
1987	4,500-5,500

Many members of the Klan are motivated by intense hatred for blacks and other minorities, both racial and religious. They believe themselves to be "super-patriotic" citizens,

and that for America to regain its "former greatness," it must be "purified." Some members of the Klan believe that since the Federal Government is over-run by Jews, Communists, and other "undesirables," its present form must come to an end, if necessary, through violence, intimidation and other similar tactics.

A second form of right-wing extremist organization manifests itself in the American neo-Nazi movement. Until 1984, the Nazis were headquartered in Arlington, VA, but in recent years, they have split into two factions: the New Order, in Wisconsin, and the National Alliance/Cosmotheist Community Church, in West Virginia. Additionally, small neo-Nazi sects operate in the following States: California (National Socialist American Workers Party), Illinois (American Nazi Party and America First Committee), Michigan (SS-Action Group), Ohio (American White Nationalist Party), Oklahoma (American Workers Party), Oregon (New Order Legion), Washington (National Socialist Vanguard), and Wisconsin (Euro-American Alliance).

For the most part, neo-Nazi groups, usually through their own publications, function as purveyors of a propaganda message that crudely slurs Jews and other minorities, lavished praises upon Hitler's Third Reich, and promotes the position that the Holocaust never occurred. They also stage "marches" with the same objectives in mind. Neo-Nazi groups, too, tend to have members who have an even greater tendency toward violence than the Ku Klux Klan.

The "Christian Identity" movement is the third set of rightwing extremist organizations. Some members of this movement believe that a nation's race—not the spirituality of its populace—is what determines the relationship with God. In brief, identity theology holds that the white race is God's chosen people, descended from the 10 lost tribes of Israel. It claims that Jews are not the children of Israel named in the Bible prophesy, but rather are impostors, or the "children of Satan." Black and others are "mistakes," which God made before He created the perfect man, a white Adam.

A number of Identity Churches are organized around the country, with the largest and most militant located in the West and Pacific Northwest. The Aryan Nation is located in northern Idaho. Other Identity groups are known by such names as the "Calvary Temple Bible Church" in Oregon, the "LaPorte Church of Christ" in Colorado, and the "Posse Comitatus," located in various States. Member of the Posse Comitatus group believe—literally—that all government authority above the county level is without validity, and individuals in these groups advocate the use of vigilante tactics.

Many members of these organizations are affiliated with more than one category of right-wing extremist groups. For example, many neo-Nazis are also members of "The Order," or other Identity affiliated "churches."

Ideology apart, other fairly recent developments link these groups. One is the "survivalist" movement, which trains people in the use of firearms and wilderness survival techniques—which in many cases are used by members of the KKK, neo-Nazis, and Identity organizations to rob banks and armored cars

and to kill those opposed to their cause. Another is the use of computer networks by leaders of these various groups to post pertinent information relating to organizational and philosophical messages.

IV

The most successful weapon used by Federal authorities against violent group crime has been the RICO statute, which focuses not on motivation, but conduct, particularly violent conduct. Congress enacted the RICO statute in 1970. It prohibits "enterprise criminality," that is, "patterns" of "racketeering," including: First, violence; second, the provision of illegal goods and services; third, corruption in government, or unions; and fourth, commercial fraud that amounts to crime, by, through, or against various types of entities. In addition to criminal sanctions, the statute authorizes a treble damage claim for relief with counsel fees for those victimized by RICO violations.

The nature of violence-prone organizations is such that RICO easily applies to them. Such organizations usually have a distinct structure and sets of rules for internal governance. If they engage in schemes to defraud the Government, to rob banks or armored cars, or to engage in drug trafficking, the means by which they obtain their money will fall within the statute's reach.

Most, if not all, of these illegal activities could be the subject of RICO criminal or civil suits. Nevertheless, the RICO statute's application to violent group activity has not been without its difficulties. Prosecutors attempted to apply RICO to a violent-prone organization in *United States v. Ivic* (700 F.2d 51 (2d Cir. 1983)). Ivic and three other active partisans of Croatia independence attempted to kill a man named Badurina, who advocated Croatia independence, but who was a vocal opponent of violence. The defendants were charged with conspiracy to kill Badurina and with conspiracy to bomb a travel agency in the vicinity of Washington Square Park and Union Square West in New York City.

Count one of the indictment alleged that the defendants and three others constituted an "enterprise" that used terror, assassination, bombings, and violence in order to foster and promote their beliefs in order to eradicate and injure persons whom they perceived as in opposition to their beliefs. Count one also charged that it was the primary object of this enterprise that the defendants "would and did receive, transport, possess, conceal, stockpile, construct, and utilize explosives, blasting caps, bombs, rifles, handguns, silencers, and ammunition."

The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit held, however, that since the Croatian nationalists had no mercenary motive, RICO did not apply. The purpose of this enterprise was to advance the goal of Croatian independence only. For RICO to apply, the "enterprise" had to be profit seeking.

The Ivic court did acknowledge that there could be certain circumstances under which members of a violence prone organization could be indicted under RICO. The court stated that "the Government tells us that in some cases terrorist organizations have engaged in robbery or extortion to obtain money to further their activities. The applicability of

RICO to such cases can be dealt with when they arise." (700 F.2d at 61 n. 6.)

In *United States v. Bagaric* (706 F.2d 42 (2d Cir. 1983)), the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reiterated its mercenary motive limitation on RICO, but, on facts similar to Ivic's, found a commercial purpose in the enterprise. In *Bagaric*, Croatian nationalists were charged with mailing extortion letters and book bombs. They also conspired over the telephone to kill people not sympathetic to their cause. Much like Ivic, the prosecutor in *Bagaric* indicted the defendants under RICO. The *Bagaric* court addressed the mercenary motive limitation read into RICO saying that the Ivic court did not state that economic gain must be the sole motive or overriding motive of every RICO enterprise. According to the court, a group does not have to make a profit to be a "RICO" enterprise. The defendant in *Bagaric* argued that there was no economic motive involved in their activity. The *Bagaric* court stressed that motive is not generally an element of a particular offense. According to the court, "Investigation into motive would serve only to publicize, and otherwise inflame, RICO prosecutions." (706 F.2d at 54.)

The defendants argued that "the enterprise itself, rather than the predicate acts of racketeering, must be shown to yield financial gains". The court held that this contention was not supported by Ivic or RICO. The *Bagaric* court characterized the Ivic holding as narrow and stated that the "Ivic holding requires no more than an objective appraisal that some economic purpose was to be accomplished by the crime charged." (Id. at 55.) The court then held that "the government may meet its obligation to show 'financial purpose' through either the enterprise or the predicate acts of racketeering." (Id. at 56.)

Summing up the meaning of this series of RICO prosecutions, Judge Constance Baker Motley, observed: "[T]he mere advocacy of ideas is a precious right in this country * * * but [i]t is these acts of violence, and not the defendant's beliefs for which [they] were tried and convicted." (New York Times, July 4, 1982.)

Mr. Speaker, RICO does not pose prosecution-of-belief type problems, since it focuses on conduct. The recent prosecution of members of "The Order" illustrates my point. Nine men and one woman were accused of committing crimes from Philadelphia to California to finance their organization, which had as its purpose creating an "Aryan homeland," that is, eliminating blacks, Jews, and "white traitors." As part of their plot, "the group planned assassinations of prominent Jews, including Norman Lear, the television producer, and Baron Eli de Rothschild, the French banker. The members of the Order were accused of involvement in two murders—that of Denver talk-show host Allen Berg, and White Supremacist Walter E. West of Athol, ID, whom the group suspected of being a Government informant, robberies netting more than \$4 million, counterfeiting, arson and weapons violations. The Government successfully prosecuted the defendants under RICO.

Five of these neo-Nazis convicted on December 31, 1985, were sentenced by Federal district court judge, Walter T. McGovern, on February 6, 1986. Each of the racketeering

counts against the defendants carried a maximum 20 year prison term and a \$25,000 fine. Gary Lee Yarbrough was sentenced to 60 years in prison in three 20-year terms to be served consecutively. Bruce Carroll Pierce was sentenced to 100 years in five 20-year terms to be served consecutively. Pierce was identified as the man who shot Mr. Allen Berg in Denver. In a statement to the court prior to sentencing, Pierce said:

"I am not going to waste my time or your time and beg for mercy. Whatever I did, I did to bring honor to myself and glory to my brothers and glory to God." (New York Times, Jan. 6, 1986.)

A 100-year sentence in 20-year consecutive terms was also imposed on Randolph George Duey, who murdered Walter West. Richard Kemp was sentenced to 60 years. Finally, Andrew Barnhill was sentenced to 40 years in consecutive 20-year terms.

Similarly, my point is well illustrated by the successful RICO prosecution of James Ellison, the founder and leader of a group known variously as "the Christian Brothers Cedar," "the Zarapeth-Horeb Church." (See *United States v. Ellison*, 793 F.2d 942 (8th Cir. (1986)). The group's goal was to "gain the supremacy of white Christians by promoting and engaging in defensive activities such as survivalism and paramilitary training, and in offensive activities intended to cause the downfall of the U.S. Government." (Id. at 945.) The group occupied a 224-acre farm in Arkansas, and established it as a religious retreat.

Through informants, Government agents learned that:

CSA was stockpiling military-type guns, fabricating silencers and grenades, converting semi-automatic weapons to automatic weapons, engaging in paramilitary training, and burying land mines around the compound perimeter. The agents also learned that CSA was involved in such activities as arson (burning Ellison's sister's house so she could collect the insurance proceeds, partially burning a Springfield, Missouri church, the congregation of which allegedly consisted of homosexuals and partially burning a Jewish community center in Indiana,) attempting to blow-up a natural gas pipeline, and theft. These activities were intended to produce operating funds, to plunder the property of certain "unacceptable" groups, and to hasten the collapse of the government. (Id. at 950.)

Ellison was charged with racketeering activities and interstate travel to promote arson, and a firearms-related charges. Ellison pleaded guilty to the firearms charges, and he was found guilty by a jury on the RICO allegations.

In reference to Ellison and his associates, U.S. Attorney J. Michael Fitzhugh aptly observed,

"We weren't after them for what they believed or what they said, but what they did." (New York Times, Sept. 7, 1988.)

Mr. Speaker, legislation has been proposed in this Congress to reform RICO. It is my belief that we must place any effort to reform RICO in the context of violence in our Nation.

Following, along with a commentary, are six suggested elements that any reform legislation ought to contain, so that RICO maybe made a more effective instrument to attack group violence.

CRIME OF VIOLENCE

No. 1. Adding as predicate offenses the relevant crimes of violence.

COMMENT

RICO was enacted in 1970. Congress has passed significant criminal legislation dealing with other crimes of violence since that time. The new offenses have not always been included in RICO. In addition, certain violent offenses, in existence in 1970, were not included in RICO.

The following offenses should be added: First, chapter 51 (homicide) of title 18; second, chapter 113A (extraterritorial jurisdiction over terrorists acts); third, section 32 (relating to destruction of aircraft or aircraft facilities) of title 18; fourth, section 81 (relating to arson) of title 18; fifth, section 112 (relating to protection of foreign officials and other persons) of title 18; sixth, section 115 (relating to assaults and other acts against Federal and other persons) of title 18; seventh, section 373 (relating to solicitation to commit a crime of violence) of title 18; eighth, section 831 (relating to prohibited transactions involving nuclear materials) of title 18; ninth, section 884 (relating to explosive materials) of title 18; tenth, section 875 (relating to interstate communications) of title 18; eleventh, section 876 (relating to mailing threatening communications) of title 18; twelfth, section 877 (relating to threatening communication from foreign country) of title 18; thirteenth, section 878 (relating to threats) of title 18; fourteenth, section 929 (relating to restricted ammunition) of title 18; fifteenth, section 1203 (involving hostage taking), of title 18; sixteenth, section 1362 (relating to communications), of title 18; seventeenth, section 1363 (relating to buildings), of title 18; eighteenth, section 1364 (relating to foreign commerce), of title 18; nineteenth, section 1366 (relating to energy) of title 18; twentieth, section 1952A (relating to murder-for-hire) of title 18; twenty-first, section 1952B (relating to violent crime in aid of racketeering) of title 18; twenty-second, section 1992 (relating to trains) of title 18; twenty-third, section 2277 (relating to vessels) of title 18.

FINANCIAL MOTIVE

No. 2. Provide that it is not necessary to show a financial motive in violence-based offenses.

The result that obtained under *United States v. Ivic* (700 F.2d 51 (2d Cir. 1983)) should be set aside. While RICO was intended to attack the infiltration of legitimate business by organized crime, it was not limited to that purpose; it was designed to apply to any form of sophisticated criminal group engaging in specified kinds of activities, including violence, without regard to the motive of the perpetrators. Motive may be relevant, but no showing of a particular kind of motive ought to be required. Ivic effectively eliminates RICO's application to organized crime-related violence not specifically tied to its moneymaking endeavors; it also makes its application problematic to other violence-based conspiracies, including certain domestic anti-Semitic or white-hate groups.

No. 3. Provide that if death results from a RICO offense life imprisonment may be imposed.

COMMENT

Currently, RICO authorizes only a 20-year term, even where multiple murders are committed as part of a pattern of racketeering activity. If death results, life imprisonment ought to be authorized. (See 18 U.S.C. §§ 241-42 (civil rights); if death results any term of years or for life)).

No. 4. Add recovery for personal injuries for crimes of violence.

COMMENT

Currently, RICO does not include recovery for personal injuries associated with crimes of violence. (See e.g., *Grogan v. Platt*, 835 F.2d 844, 845-48 (11th Cir. 1988) (estates of FBI agents killed by robbery suspects, denied RICO civil recovery, since statute limited to injury to "business or property"). This defect should be cured. (See, e.g., 18 U.S.C. § 16 (definition of "crime of violence") (physical force against person or property)).

No. 5. Provide for equity relief, that is, freeze orders.

COMMENT

Currently, RICO has been interpreted to exclude equity relief for private parties under Federal law. (*Compare Religious Technology Center v. Wollersheim*, 796 F.2d 1076, 1080-89 (9th Cir. 1986) (denied as a matter of legislative interest despite policy reasons in support), cert. denied, 107 S. Ct. 1336 (1987) with *Chambers Development Co., Inc. v. Browning Ferris Industries*, 590 F. Supp. 1528, 1540-41 (W.D. Pa. 1984) (upheld)). Such relief is, of course, available under State law for pendent claims. (See, e.g., *Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Antonio*, 649 F. Supp. 1352 (D. Colo. 1986), aff'd, 843 F.2d 1311 (10th Cir. 1988)).

Unless such relief is available, private parties will not be able to secure, under a uniform rule, full justice. Forum shopping, too, will be promoted. It is particularly necessary that preliminary freeze orders be available. (See, e.g., *Int'l Control Corp. Vesco*, 490 F.2d 1334 (2d Cir.) (corrupt financier assets, including Boeing 707, yacht, and stock, frozen) cert. denied, 417 U.S. 932 (1974)). Unless assets can be preserved during litigation against violent crime or similar offenders, it is doubtful that RICO litigation will even be instituted against them. Ironically, that may mean that RICO will be only used against white-collar offenders who have substantial assets in the community, for whom no need exists for freeze orders.

No. 6. Provide for international service of process.

COMMENT

Currently, RICO provides for nationwide, but not international, service of process. (See e.g., *Nordic Bank PLC v. Trend Group Ltd.*, 619 F. Supp. 542, 564-65 n.30 (S.D. N.Y. 1985)). Such service of process is essential to deal with criminal groups whose activities, often violent, extend across international boundaries. It is provided for the securities statutes. (See e.g., *SEC v. Kasser*, 548 F.2d 109, 116 (2d Cir. 1977) ("United States must not be permitted to become a 'Barbary Coast' (for fraud)"), cert. denied, 431 U.S. 938 (1977)).

VI

Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1988, I introduced for myself and our distinguished colleague, Mr. DON EDWARDS, H.R. 4920, "The Crime Control Act of 1988." (134 CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD H4832 daily ed June 28, 1988). Each of these recommendations to strengthen RICO as it applies to violence-prone organizations are incorporated in H.R. 4920. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws, I expect to process these recommendations, along with others, in the coming months. I urge each Member of this body to study early these proposals for the reform of RICO and to give their full support. I look forward to the prospect of RICO reform legislation before the end of the 100th Congress.

ESCALATE THE FIGHT AGAINST AIDS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the fiscal year 1989 appropriation for the Department of Health and Human Services, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to the proposed spending levels for AIDS education and research.

Over the last several days there has been a series of shocking and extremely troubling revelations about the seriousness of the epidemic that we face. Federal health officials now estimate that at least 450,000 persons in this country will have been diagnosed with AIDS by 1993. That amounts to one new case of AIDS every 14 minutes. And we now know that unless an effective treatment for this terrible disease is found, all of those people will die.

The bill we are considering here today includes more than \$1.2 billion for research, education, and other activities aimed at the treatment and prevention of this deadly disease—an increase of \$308 million over current levels. In addition to the funds appropriated in this legislation, the Federal Government will spend close to \$900 million in fiscal year 1989 on AIDS treatment, testing and research through Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, the Departments of Labor, Defense, and other Federal agencies.

Clearly, identifying a cure for AIDS is our ultimate goal. Currently, however, prevention is only one way to combat the spread of AIDS—that means educating people, at the earliest practical age, about how the disease is transmitted.

Part of the tragedy of this epidemic is that most of the victims are young, and that we are robbed of their potential just as it is being realized. We must insure that efforts to develop drugs which help the body fight AIDS are not allowed by even a day for lack of resources. Furthermore, I believe that Congress is long overdue in setting forth, in any comprehensive manner, a national policy dealing with AIDS testing and counseling.

Public health officials, including the Surgeon General, agree that in all but a few circumstances, mandatory testing for the AIDS virus is bad public health policy, and would, in fact, be counterproductive. First, mandatory testing programs would tend to drive the disease under ground because people who fear they might have the disease will be wary of coming

forward to be tested. Also, there is widespread agreement that across-the-board testing of certain subgroups is not a cost-effective use of the limited resources we have to fight AIDS.

Mr. WAXMAN has introduced the Federal AIDS Policy Act, which would establish the necessary legal framework under which voluntary testing and counseling programs would be most effective. I believe this legislation approaches these issues in a thoughtful and compassionate manner. The bill would establish Federal guidelines for voluntary testing and counseling, provide assurances for confidentiality in testing and counseling so those at greatest risk will be encouraged to seek assistance, and authorize \$400 million in each of the next 3 years for AIDS research.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to effectively fight this disease, it is imperative that Congress acts to insure the confidentiality of AIDS test results, and that we prohibit discrimination against persons who carry the virus. Without such protections, the effectiveness of testing programs will be undermined greatly, because few people will be willing to come forward to be tested if doing so could cost them their home or job. To combat AIDS, it will require enlightened social policy as well as intensive research. The bill that we are considering today will make possible the latter. Now, let us move quickly and install a thoughtful public policy to enhance these efforts.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PIETRO PAOLO AND TERESA DINI IN CELEBRATION OF THEIR 25TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very special couple, Mr. and Mrs. Pietro Paolo and Teresa Dini, of Stockton, CA, in celebration of their 25th wedding anniversary this August 24, 1988. As Italian immigrants to the United States in the early fifties, their road to romance has been very special and unique.

Their story begins over 30 years ago at a time when Italy was still suffering a postwar economic depression. At the young age of 17, Teresa Flocchini, the daughter of a proud merchant, left the small village of Forno d'Orno, and traveled thousands of miles on a boat to the shores of New York. Upon her arrival in 1955, she was very enthusiastic about experiencing new sights and opportunities. She continued to travel and made her final destination in Stockton, CA, where she lived with her aunt, Mary Salvadori. Shortly thereafter, she became employed as a live-in maid and pursued studies in English. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that during these early years, Teresa continued to send most of her earnings back to Italy. Her financial support was of great assistance in paving the road for her family to immigrate to the United States in 1957.

In the spring of 1963, while attending a ballroom dance, she met a handsome and charm-

ing young man by the name of Pietro Paolo Dini. Paolo was also from Italy, who had left his friends and family of Corfino, Garfagnana, a small village located in the beautiful mountain ridges of Tuscany, in order to seek adventure and prosperity in the new land. As a newcomer to the United States, Paolo held two jobs, both of which involved great physical endurance and labor. Meanwhile, he vigorously pursued English courses at Humphrey's College. They immediately fell in love and embarked upon a passionate and loving courtship which resulted in the exchange of wedding vows only 6 months later.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years have passed since that joyous event which took place on August 24, 1963. Today, it is with great pride and joy that I congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Pietro Paolo and Teresa Dini in celebrating their silver anniversary. As proud and hardworking immigrants of this Nation, Paul and Teresa have continuously demonstrated their commitment to a goal of happiness and security for themselves and their two children, Marina and Benny. Indeed, Paolo and Teresa have come a long way from their respective villages in Italy, to find a most priceless treasure—their undying love and enduring friendship for one another—which has lasted over a quarter of a century.

What a beautiful story!

LELAND DEAN—OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZEN

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Leland Dean of Chillicothe, OH.

Because of her willingness to give of her time and energy to the people of her community, Leland Dean has been selected by the Ross County Senior Citizens Center for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Leland has worked diligently for the Senior Citizens Center and its patrons. She has served as a volunteer since 1972. In addition, Leland has been a member of the Nutrition Advisory Council for the last 5 years. Moreover, she has always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of the center's efforts and local activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Leland's family and all of her many friends are proud of her achievements. It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Leland for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that she will continue to share her good spirits with the people of Ross County, and we wish her every success in her endeavors.

TOWARD A REAL GLASNOST FOR ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Lev Dobriansky, a man who is known and admired by many Members of Congress, was the keynote speaker at this year's Captive Nations Week meeting in Taipei, Taiwan. His address focused on the need for a true reform—indeed, true liberation—in all countries that are under Communist control.

Mr. Dobriansky acknowledged that "every Communist state with its disproportionate military establishment is in basic, institutional economic trouble," but he went on to say that the free world cannot afford to let its guard down. He views glasnost and perestroika as pragmatic attempts by Communist governments to reinvigorate their own regimes, but he remains convinced that no Communist Party once entrenched in power will ever give up its monopoly on political control.

I am sure that all Members will find the remarks by this noted scholar, author, and diplomat to be very enlightening, and so I ask that Dr. Dobriansky's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The text of the speech follows:

TOWARD A REAL GLASNOST FOR ALL THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

Premier Yu, Distinguished Members of Government, Honored Guests, Friends of the Captive Nations Globalwide:

I feel deeply privileged to join with you in this 30th Observance of Captive Nations Week. This is not my first time here in our mutual international effort; that first time was in 1961 when your farsighted countrymen under the able leadership of Dr. Ku Chang-kang took up this call for global attention by the U.S. government. In a true, spiritual sense, and as in the case of countless others, your Republic has been my second home.

At the very outset, permit me to pay the sincerest tribute to the people of the ROC for their miraculous economic development and political stability over the past four decades. I and others have seen it, millions about the globe have heard of it and marvel at it, and numerous countries about the world now seek to duplicate it. But this material progress is only one side of this enthralling story; there is, too, the equally important moral and spiritual side underscoring the cause for world freedom, the ultimate and eventual liberation of all the captive nations. In this respect, there aren't words sufficient to express our boundless tribute and gratitude to Dr. Ku, WACL, and APACL for their lasting contributions to this most basic of objectives. And I know and have the fullest confidence that their accomplishments will be solidly projected and magnified under the inspiring leadership of Dr. Clement Chang.

On record since 1959—when the U.S. Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution and President Eisenhower signed it into Public Law 86-90—the most outstanding single observances of the Week have occurred here in the Republic of China, displaying this moral and spiritual dedication

to a cause we in the Free World so fervently share. We in the United States have reached our high point with President Reagan who has been the first president to sign the annual proclamation of the Week in public ceremony at the White House; the first to issue proclamations in total consonance with the letter and spirit of Congress' resolution; the first to maintain an ardent consistency in all this; the first president to have defined accurately the USSR as an empire in itself. And during his presidency no new communist-dominated captive nation has emerged to add to the long list of captive nations. Where firmly principled men and women, whether in Washington or Taipei and elsewhere, boldly uphold the fundamental principles and values of civilized life, the cause for world freedom is more than half won.

My friends, in the past year the print and air waves of the world have saturated us with the terms "glasnost" and "perestroika". What is patently needed at this time is a global "glasnost", an openness of mind and dialogue about all the captive nations. The list of captive nations is a long one, extending from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ukraine and others since the early 20s to Afghanistan and Nicaragua in the late 70s. Well over two dozen nations are on this list, and the largest of them all is, of course, Mainland China. They are in Asia, within the Soviet Union, in Central Europe, the Mideast, Africa, the Caribbean and Central America. One of the chief functions of the annual Captive Nations Week has been for citizens in the Free World to remember this list, even realistically asking "who's next?" And the record shows, from Khrushchev and Mao on, that communist party monopolists and totalitarians cannot bear this "institutional memory".

From the viewpoint of popular education, just imagine if leading citizens in all still free countries had and intimately knew this long list of captive nations, extending from the early 20s to the present. They would possess not only a fixed perspective on the nature of communism but also an invaluable instrument to counter and undermine it. Current danger like abounding regions Nicaragua, the Philippines, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, South Africa would profit immensely from this process of popular enlightenment. The concrete experiences of subjugation suffered by the captive nations by far surpass in value the contents of all the volumes that have been written about communism.

Today, changes are indeed sweeping the communist states, but the burning question is "How real, how fundamental and substantial are they as affect the rights and aspirations of the underlying captive nations and peoples?" Today, in varying degree, every communist state with its disproportionate military establishment is in basic, institutional economic trouble—from North Korea to Vietnam, Mainland China to South Yemen, the Soviet Union to Mozambique, Yugoslavia and Hungary to Cuba and Nicaragua. Let's remember, this is not the first time most have been in such chaotic trouble. As of now, Communist China has more perestroika—a restructuring—than glasnost, while the Soviet Union has more glasnost—open talk—than perestroika, and both haven't nearly enough of each to satisfy the requirements of a genuine liberalization and democratic trend for the captive nations and peoples. Referring to the captive people, a high Chinese Communist official tapped the truth of the current changes in

observing, "The 'Bird' is still in the cage, only we have widened the cage."

Ladies and gentlemen, for us and for the captive nations and peoples, the ideal would be the complete removal of the cage. Short of this in the short-run, our responsibility and obligation is to seek by every possible and prudent means the pressured widening of the cage. Only the blindly naive can think that these changes spell genuine peace, sincere disarmament, the cessation of Leninist political warfare, the diminution of communist political power, true democracy, or the emancipation of the captive people. These changes in their measured widening of the cage are clearly aimed at higher peoples' productivity, a reenergized economic growth and strength of the communist state, an ever more modernized military and, in calculated time, with enhanced, perestroikade political power, still more aggressive action in the generation of new captive nations. And all this, they so plan, with the detente, economic assistance of the Free World, even without a substantial human rights price tag.

Human memories are short, while wishful hopes are again long. We've been there before in previous cycles of detente and peaceful coexistence. Today, the same illusions are re-emerging: the illusion that the Cold War has ended; the illusion that capitalism is overcoming the communists' systemic fraud of socialism; the illusion that trade with the basically totalitarian communist regimes will insure a genuine peace, and the illusion that these monopolistic regimes, by virtue of their necessitated reorganization marked by essentially spurious contests between "liberal" and "conservative" elements, are on the run in the global struggle. If anything, these re-emerging illusions in the Free World conclusively attest to our failure to recognize the constant of political warfare in the ongoing struggle. In a few words, monopolist communist parties—the only real, single legacy of Facism and Leninism—cannot by their nature endure without this constant and, most assuredly, they are not preparing to commit suicide.

Finally, how do we cope with this challenge? Certainly, a simple-minded accommodation of the communist party monopolists' aims is not the answer. The captive nations fall within different regions of the globe where each has its special problems, characteristics and peculiarities. There is no one policy relevant to all, but there is a strategy applicable to all. Given the common sense requisites of political will, strong defense and economic power, the strategy is one of persistent focus on the captive nations in the aggregate. In short, a global glasnost about the captive nations and peoples—their struggle for real democratization, a real perestroika of economic freedom, a real environment of human rights—and eventually a real liberation of the captive nations.

Under this strategic umbrella, respective policies—political, economic, military etc.—will cautiously and prudently fall in place. The liberation of Afghanistan and Nicaragua typifies only one policy mode among many. Their freedom would be unprecedented and catalytic in the first rollback of the captive nations list. Whatever the required policy, the strategy provides purpose, direction and moral commitment. As President Reagan emphasized after the Moscow summit, "we must never cease telling the truth". Friends, you know and I know, the widely spoken truth about the captive nations in toto is in the enduring spirit of the American Revolution and the "Three Prin-

ciples of the People." Yes, we must never, never cease telling it so long as the communist party monopolists exist to exploit the peoples and resources of the captive nations.

ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY AND PARENTHOOD ACT OF 1988

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join Representative MICKEY LELAND today in introducing the Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenthood Act of 1988.

Adolescent pregnancy will not be solved in the United States by just saying no—the problem is already here. One million U.S. teenagers become pregnant each year. There is one-in-three chance that a teen mother will have a second child while still in her teens. Teen pregnancy is a personal tragedy that has reached crisis proportions in this country.

Teenage parents need direction. They are thrown into an adult world while they are still children. They face a myriad of grownup problems any adult would have trouble handling. Bearing children too soon in one's own development and with inadequate prenatal care can mean a low birth-weight child with a high risk of infant mortality. New parenting responsibilities often mean that young mothers will not finish high school, not find a job with a salary that would support a family, and fall back on welfare. Even if teen parents get married, few of these marriages have the emotional maturity to weather adult stresses.

The Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenthood Act of 1988 promotes more than moral outrage to help young parents take control of their lives. It would replace the present Adolescent Family Life Program with an active, interventionist approach providing an array of comprehensive, preventive, and followup services such as prenatal and postpartum care; well-baby and well-child care; family planning services and preventive education; family life and parenting services; education, training and employment services; and, counseling in nutrition, substance abuse, and adoption.

It offers assistance to mothers 18 years old and under, mothers of children under 6 who had their first child as a teenager, and their children. And, not only mothers and children are eligible, but fathers are eligible as well. We will never successfully address the problem of adolescent pregnancy until young men understand that they share responsibility with young women for the conception and birth of a child, and are equally responsible for its well-being after it is born.

Countless studies and demonstration programs have already proven that this approach works. We need to address the causes of teen pregnancy in this country and help our young people live out their lives as responsible citizens. Estimates place the costs of teen pregnancy in 1985 at \$16.6 billion in AFDC, Medicaid, and food stamps—and far too much in wasted human potential.

If you are truly concerned about the Nation's children please join us in supporting a program that actively intervenes in their lives.

SALE OF F-18 AIRCRAFT TO KUWAIT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter the Committee on Foreign Affairs received August 3, 1988, from the Secretary of State regarding the sale of F-18 aircraft to Kuwait.

This letter was provided to the Congress near the end of the period of review of this sale pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act. The letter provides certain assurances regarding this sale and addresses some concerns which were expressed by the Congress during its consideration of the sale and in hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East and the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The August 3 letter to Chairman DANTE FASCELL follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, DC, August 3, 1988.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On July 7, 1988, the Administration notified the Congress of the United States of its intention to sell forty F/A-18 C/D aircraft to the Government of Kuwait. The sale, valued at approximately two billion dollars, includes appropriate associated munitions, spares, support equipment, services and training. In the course of the debate and deliberations by the Congress on the merits of the sale, a number of questions have arisen that I would like to address here.

Kuwait highly values its twenty-five year political, economic and security relationship with the United States. It is a multi-faceted relationship that reflects common philosophies and regional and international goals. Kuwaiti investment in the United States and the West is a testament to both U.S. and Kuwaiti commitment to the health of free market economies; Kuwait consistently supports negotiated, peaceful solutions to regional and extraregional conflicts; Kuwait has been at the forefront of efforts to combat terrorism; Kuwait has been a major source of economic assistance to developing countries around the world; and, Kuwait has been an active partner in our naval presence in the Gulf, diplomatically and logistically.

Kuwait has underscored its commitment to this relationship through its request for a US-origin aircraft as the mainstay of its air force, and its defense. It seeks a current generation aircraft to replace an aging fleet of US-origin A-4s. The Government of Kuwait has stated, and we accept, that these planes are for the legitimate, and very real, self-defense needs of the State. Kuwait is located in a volatile environment and faces both near-term and long-term air, sea and land threats. As the Minister of Cabinet

Affairs stated to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on July 14, Kuwait would prefer to invest its money solely in social and educational development for its people. That is unrealistic. Unfortunately, despite its own history of peaceful coexistence with its neighbors, Kuwait must be able to provide a credible deterrent to potential adversaries.

Kuwait also has defined and recognized collective self-defense responsibilities with the other members of the Gulf Cooperation Council, as sanctioned by the UN Charter and encouraged by the United States. The efforts by the GCC to enhance the self-defense ability of all member states is in the U.S. and Western interest. It bespeaks also a mature understanding and willingness to assume a shared burden, with us and others, for the stability and the security of the vital Gulf region. The multi-functional F-18 was chosen by Kuwait as most appropriate to meet these legitimate needs. It is for these reasons that the Administration supports the request.

The Administration has been in close consultation with the Government of Kuwait throughout the selection process for the F-18, and its associated munitions. We have also examined carefully with the Kuwaiti Government the use, basing and transfer issues involved in such a sale. The Kuwaiti Government is fully aware of the conditions of sale of any U.S. defense system, as contained in a Letter of Offer and Acceptance. In addition, the Government of Kuwait in 1976 signed a technical security arrangement regarding safeguarding classified military articles, services and information. Kuwait has a perfect record of compliance with the terms of this agreement—as well as all previous LOAs. Based on our extension conversations with the Kuwaiti Government, Kuwait's commitments to us and our ability to verify their compliance, I would like to provide you with the following assurances and understandings.

BASING

The Government of Kuwait has assured us that the F-18 will be based solely in the State of Kuwait. The Prime Minister and Crown Prince confirmed this assurance to the Administration and the Congress during his official visit last month. We accept those assurances as consistent with Kuwait's desire to provide for its own first-line of defense. Given the population and military inventory superiority of each of its neighbors, it would be illogical for Kuwait to base them elsewhere and denude itself of this defense arm. Furthermore, given the unique nature of the support equipment necessary to the aircraft, equipment not available elsewhere in the region, it would be impossible, as a practical matter, to support the aircraft if they were based out of Kuwait.

REFUELING CAPABILITY

The Government of Kuwait has assured the Administration that it does not seek a refueling capability for the F-18, either as a part of this sale or independent of it. Furthermore, Kuwait does not meet the U.S.G. global criteria for sale of refueling capability. And, finally, should circumstances warrant a review of this, Congress retains, under Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the option to disapprove any potential proposed sale in the future.

TRANSFER OF AIRCRAFT AND/OR MUNITIONS

The Government of Kuwait has assured us that it fully understands and accepts the provisions of the standard Letter of Offer and Acceptance, which is specific, inter alia, on prohibiting unauthorized transfer of US-

origin equipment to a third party. Over the history of our security relationship, the Government of Kuwait has assiduously abided by the terms of that agreement.

There are practical inhibitions to transfers of aircraft or munitions. First, to transfer either would strip Kuwait of its defense shield and leave it vulnerable to attack. Second, the support equipment necessary cannot be duplicated or purchased elsewhere; its transfer would be readily detected. Third, other states would not be able to use the equipment. They would lack the infrastructure, and the training.

On the specific question of transfer of munitions, especially the Maverick G missiles, they could not be used by states lacking the aircraft and software appropriate to the missile system. For example, an aircraft designed to carry the Maverick A/B has both different hardware and, more importantly, software than needed for the G models. Neither can be adapted easily and without detection. It is for similar reasons that the A/B models are not appropriate to this aircraft. Significant design and computer modifications would have to be made to the F-18 to accommodate the A/B.

SECURITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF EQUIPMENT

The Government of Kuwait has assured us that all necessary steps will be taken to protect the aircraft, its systems and its technology from unauthorized diversion. As stated earlier, the Government has signed, and scrupulously adhered to the terms of the technical security arrangements of 1976. In twelve years there have been no violations of this arrangement nor has loss of classified equipment or information ever been alleged or documented.

Compliance with and adherence to the arrangement, and other U.S. regulations, is monitored by U.S. Liaison Office personnel assigned to Kuwait. Periodic evaluations and inspections are also undertaken by the Defense Investigative Service's Office of Industrial Security, International. Unauthorized diversion of missiles would encounter the same technical problems in use as stated earlier—without an aircraft designed for delivery of the missile, it is useless.

The Administration shares Congressional sensitivity to the issue of unbridled arms proliferation, especially in volatile regions. We are actively engaged in multilateral efforts to limit and control the spread of high technology—such as IRBMs. However, U.S. restrictions on arms sales are stricter than those of other arms sellers, thus allowing us to address the legitimate defense needs of vulnerable friends while simultaneously preventing unwarranted arms sales.

The proposed sale of forty F-18 aircraft, we believe, stands on its own merits. It addresses legitimate defense needs of a valued and longstanding friend. It addresses U.S. national security and political interests in a vital part of the world. Understandably, Congress has expressed concerns and raised questions regarding the sale. We welcome the dialogue and believe, based on the assurances we have received from the Government of Kuwait, our ability to monitor these assurances, and the above noted practical realities, that we have responded fully to them. I would hope that the Congress will join with the Administration in support of this important and worthy sale.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ.

TARIFF ON HDI-MONOMER

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would maintain the current tariff level on 1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate—more commonly known as HDI-monomer—for 3 years. Without this measure, conversion to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule will more than double the duties on HDI-monomer from 7.9 percent ad valorem, to 16.2 percent ad valorem plus 2.9 cents per kilogram.

A company in my State manufactures specialized resins for polyurethane coatings which require the use of HDI-monomer. These complex and sophisticated resins have exceptional wear and durability and are used for, among other things, coatings on military equipment and Government vehicles.

The company is unable to purchase HDI-monomer domestically. Because the contracts of this company and its downstream customers require the special characteristics of these resins, importation of the chemical is necessary.

Beginning January 1, 1989, the Harmonized Tariff Schedule is to go into effect, via implementing legislation in the trade bill, H.R. 4848. Because of the reclassification from the U.S. Tariff Schedule into the new international Harmonized Schedule, HDI-monomer will be subject to a duty increase of more than 100 percent. This change is not based on any change or variance in chemical composition or any congressional decision to increase HDI-monomer tariffs. It is solely a result of the technical process of converting to the Harmonized Schedule, a process which Congress intended to be duty neutral.

Mr. Speaker, the affected party plans to build its own plant in the U.S. for the production of HDI-monomer. However, planning and construction will take several years. In the meantime, the economic viability of its manufacture of these important resins is threatened because of the tariff increase. Therefore, I believe this temporary maintenance of the rate currently imposed under the U.S. Tariff Schedule, should be adopted.

This bill provides a change in duty for a temporary period of time, which will give the USTR an opportunity to renegotiate more equitable treatment under the Harmonized Schedule. Yet economically, it is of tremendous consequence to the manufacturer. I urge its expeditious consideration.

SERVICE CONTRACT ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROCEDURES ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, there has been a trend of having private companies perform work that had previ-

ously been done by Government employees. But there is no evidence to indicate that this practice, called contracting out, has helped to promote a more efficient government or that it has helped save taxpayers' dollars. There have been a number of occasions where letting the contract to a private business actually cost the taxpayers more money and cut Government efficiency.

In light of the recent Pentagon procurement scandal, it is clear that Congress must take steps to end fraud, waste, and abuse in Government purchasing of goods and services. So today I rise to introduce a bill aimed at promoting procurement efficiency, reducing Federal expenditures, and providing for accountability when contracting for Government support services. The Service Contract Accountability and Procedures Act will provide consistent contracting procedures for Federal Government support services, insure true competition and public accountability, and prevent waste. The act also requires agency decisions to be recorded for public review and to be supported by studies indicating that contracting out for services will cut costs and improve the quality of services.

I am completely in favor of contracting out when it saves money for the taxpayer and increases Government efficiency. But a recent General Accounting Office report shows that the current procurement system must be reexamined and overhauled. The report, submitted to my colleague from Virginia, HERBERT BATEMAN, detailed substantial cost overruns on contracts let to the private sector. Since 1983 actual costs of the contract at Virginia's Fort Eustis have been 70 percent higher than originally estimated; the contractor was paid more than 90 percent of the incentive fee allowable under a cost-plus contract; actual payments have been \$20 million higher than the contractor's original cost bid of \$27.9 million; and the total cost of performing the functions would have been less had the work remained with Federal employees.

A contracting program that allows this kind of cost overrun and lack of accountability must be brought under control. Congress and the public have right to know what is being done with the billions of dollars that are earmarked for service contracts. My bill would make Federal agencies accountable for their actions, prevent fraud and cost overruns, and increase Government efficiency. I urge all my colleagues to join me in this effort.

**TOM AND DOROTHY BREED-
ING—OUTSTANDING SENIOR
CITIZENS**

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Tom and Dorothy Breeding of Leesburg, OH.

Because of their willingness to give of their time and energy to the people of their community, Tom and Dorothy Breeding have been

nominated by the Highland County Senior Citizens Center for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Tom has volunteered his talents to the center by repairing small appliances for the senior citizens at no charge. If these grateful persons insist on paying him for his time, Tom requests that they make a donation to the Highland County Senior Citizens Center.

Dorothy volunteers in many different programs of the center. She regularly visits the residents of neighborhood nursing homes. In addition, Dorothy assists with all center fundraising projects.

Both Dorothy and Tom provide free transportation to Dayton, Cincinnati, and Columbus doctor's offices and area hospitals for those who are unable to care for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Tom and Dorothy have worked diligently for the Senior Citizens Center and its patrons. It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Tom and Dorothy and their family for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that they will continue to share their good spirits with the people of Highland County, and we wish them every success in their endeavors.

THE BOXING LABOR STANDARDS ACT

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation designed to begin the long awaited effort to bring basic worker health and safety protections to folks who labor in the sport of boxing. Many of us here in Congress have believed that the sport of boxing is in grave jeopardy unless a way is found to provide these athletes basic minimum health and safety standards.

This legislation is the recognition of the appropriate Federal role in the protection of workers rights. This legislation simply establishes labor standards within the confines of existing health and safety law. This legislation amends the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to include specific minimum standards in all States that sanction boxing matches.

For far too long we have denied these workers basic labor standards and this legislation is a simple direct way to provide it. Make no mistake about it, if Congress does not choose to provide minimum standards then no protection will be extended. And within a short number of years legislators will be faced with the ultimate form of regulation which will be increasing calls for banning of the sport. Expanding existing labor laws to include a group of workers who face possible death or injury on the job is not a revolutionary concept. Just because these workers labor in a sport should not exclude them from basic worker protection.

In past efforts to address problems in the sport I believe the Congress has been too focused on the regulation of the interstate commerce aspects of the boxing business. There is little support for this type of regulation.

There is however a great deal of support for protecting fighters in the ring and I believe it is time to get on with it. My approach is simple and direct. We owe the same basic worker protections to boxers as are provided to other American workers. The bill also incorporates the idea of promoting voluntary assistance for fighters by establishing an institute within the Labor Department which will coordinate various proposals for the protection and assistance to fighters. As a fan I know that this is needed and as a legislator I can not turn back on these workers.

CLAY SCHOLARSHIPS MAKING DREAMS COME TRUE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the education of our youth is the cornerstone of our development as a nation. Our distinguished colleague from Missouri, BILL CLAY, is not only committed to the education of our youth, but he is making dreams come true for economically disadvantaged students in the St. Louis area.

This year, the William L. Clay Scholarship and Research Fund Awards program will provide educational scholarships for eight high school students. During its 3-year history, the program has provided more than \$240,000 in scholarships to 18 students in the St. Louis area.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a recent article from the St. Louis American regarding the success of the William L. Clay Scholarship and Research Fund Awards. I hope that my colleagues will join me in commending Congressman CLAY for his efforts in investing in the future of our Nation and, more importantly, for making dreams come true for youth in his congressional district.

[From the St. Louis American, July 14-20, 1988]

**CLAY SCHOLARSHIPS MAKING DREAMS COME
TRUE**

(By Sharon Green)

In a stride toward academic excellence for economically disadvantaged area high school students, Congressman William L. Clay, Sr. D-1st District again sponsored the college educations of eight more students in an awards luncheon last week, bringing the three-year scholarship total to more than \$240,000.

Clay related the scholarship to ideas that started during the turn of the century when the great debate between W.E.B. DuBois, founder of the NAACP and Booker T. Washington (founder of the Tuskegee Institute) who disputed the quality of an academic versus technical skill training.

Noting that most people sided with Washington who stressed that "there is as much beauty in plowing a field as there is in writing a poem," Clay said that after 88 years of plowing the fields with dignity and class, black people need to set academic goals for themselves in the workplace.

"This program is about some who now would like to write those poems and would

like to build the bridges and would like to teach nuclear physics," Clay said.

The William L. Clay Scholarship and Research Fund Awards are designed for full-time study toward a bachelor's degree. The scholarships, renewable based on the student maintaining a B average, usually covers full tuition and books but they are based upon each individual student's financial need, according to Geraldine Johnson, vice president of the scholarship board.

"We picked those who needed it worst first," Johnson said. Academically sound students residing in the city and the county who were recommended by high school counselors were selected for the scholarship.

At some point in the near future Clay said the plan is to induct 15 students at one time to add to the total of 18 students who have received scholarships since the first two students were awarded scholarships in 1985.

The 1988-89 recipients were: Leslie DuBose, O'Fallon Technical High School, \$1,200 Harris-Stowe; Felicia A. Ezell, McClure North High School, \$2,800 to Millikin University in Decatur, IL; Lisa Evon Jones, Normandy Senior High School, \$1,800 to Alabama State University; Brian I. Lane, Normandy Senior High School, \$3,450 to Benedict College in Columbia, SC; Gwendolyn McCloud, Sumner High School, \$1,000 to Smith College in North Hampton, NJ; Sheryl R. Parker, University City High School, \$1,650 to Florida A&M, and Terrell Tankin, Cleveland ROTC, \$2,100 to South-west Baptist University, Bolivar, MO.

Three students also were awarded the first Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Scholarships which were coordinated by Carol A. Clay, the congressman's wife. The recipients included: Kathy A. Price, Soldan High School, \$1,200 to Harris-Stowe State College; Anissa Fay Brown, Cleveland ROTC, \$3,450 to Benedict College in North Hampton, NJ, and Nicole Williams, Cardinal Ritter High School, \$1,350 to St. Louis University.

Past recipients had advice for this year's winners. Nikkel Thompson, 18, a last year winner and a student at Drake University, warned this year's recipients that they will have to manage their time wisely and set aside time to study. Gary Millner, 20, at Southeast Missouri State in Cape Girardeau, suggested that the new winner "pray a lot, make your own decisions and budget your money."

Alissa Bonner, one of the first winners in 1985, said she didn't have anyone to tell how it was going to be when she went to Howard University in Washington, DC from Vashon High School. A major in accounting, Bonner will graduate in May 1989 and is planning to go on to get a master's degree in taxation. She said she would do a lot of things differently if she had a chance to do it all again as she gave experienced advice for the winners.

"Get all that you can while you are there. ... Have all the fun you want but you will be sorry," she warned.

AMENIA CELEBRATES ITS BICENTENNIAL

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here today to celebrate Amenia's bicentennial.

A flag will be flown over the capital in honor of Amenia's 200th anniversary, and it will be my privilege to present to the town of Amenia that flag, as well as a framed copy of my remarks in the House of Representatives and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to read from that statement:

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise in honor of the bicentennial of the town of Amenia in Dutchess County in my home District of New York.

Amenia was founded on March 7, 1788—a year in which the New York State legislature established more than 200 towns.

The poet Dr. Thomas Young thought up the community's name. It is derived from the Latin word "Amoenia," ["AH"] as in "father"—"MOI" as in "oil"—"na" which means "pleasant."

Indeed, the countryside—offering vistas of Cascade Mountain, Smithfield Valley and De La Vergne Hill—must have been Pleasing to the settlers, as it is to residents today. There is a special resonance to the names of the town's roads—Deep Hollow, Butts Hollow, Bog Hollow and Sinpatch.

The first significant immigration came in the 18th century, when inexpensive farmland attracted settlers from New York and New England.

Iron ore was discovered in Amenia in the 1760's. A foundry and furnace supplied iron and steel for the war effort in the American War of Independence.

The Amenia seminary, a Private Methodist academy established in 1835, enjoyed a good academic reputation and attracted students from throughout the Nation.

Today Amenia still has great vistas, as well as outstanding educational and cultural opportunities within an 80-mile radius. The town—which comprises many neighborhoods, including Smithfield, Wassaic, Box Hollow, Leedsville, South Amenia and Amenia Union—is particularly noteworthy for its community spirit. Volunteers contribute greatly to the town by serving on town boards, volunteer fire departments and rescue squads and other praiseworthy organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the town has proclaimed August 13 as a time of official celebration. There will be a community picnic, and the Lions club has donated a birthday cake large enough to feed 400. I am looking forward to taking part in the ceremonies.

I wish the people of Amenia the best as they celebrate their bicentennial.

This year we also celebrate the bicentennial of our Constitution and renew our appreciation for the independence of our Nation. President Eisenhower, speaker on July 4, 1959, uttered remarks that still ring true today:

This date annually commemorates and renews our dedication to the principles of freedom, of government elected by the people, of equal opportunity for all.

As we enjoy today and assemble here freely—we celebrate the Constitution.

When we speak our minds on the problems facing our country without fear of sanctions, we celebrate the Constitution.

When we enjoy the security of knowing that government cannot deprive us of "life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," we celebrate the Constitution.

The success of American Government—at the Federal, State, and local levels—is the interest and involvement of our citizenry. The Constitution challenges each generation to involve ourselves in public affairs.

As long as we have such fine, patriotic citizens as those gathered here today, we will continue to live in a democracy second to none.

THE AT-RISK YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING AMENDMENTS OF 1988

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill at the request of the administration which would amend the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] to add an enriched employment and training program alternative for at-risk youth. This legislation would specifically revise JTPA's Title II-B Summer Youth Employment Program to allow local service delivery areas the option of using funds under the Title II-B Program to provide year-round comprehensive programs of intense services for youth determined to be at risk of chronic unemployment and to change the method by which funds under that program are allocated.

Even though I am introducing this bill on behalf of the administration, I wholeheartedly support its goal—to significantly strengthen service deliverers' ability to break down the many barriers that stand in the way of these young people, ultimately increasing their long-term employability. While the youth unemployment picture has improved in recent years, with the unemployment rate for black youths declining more than 15 percentage points from the recession highs of the early 1980's, it is still three times the adult rate, with the black youth unemployment rate over six times as great.

Recognizing that many young people continue to face multiple impediments to successfully entering the work force, including a lack of basic skills, drug and alcohol abuse, teen pregnancy, behavioral difficulties, and disruptive living conditions, this legislation proposes a coordinated approach to address these problems. Through opting to carry out this program, service delivery areas could provide a package of education, job training, counseling, and employment services to assist participants in overcoming such difficulties.

The need for this type of comprehensive approach becomes more and more evident as we approach the year 2000 with the increasing demands that will be placed on the future work force. In the coming years our population will grow more slowly than in the past, but at the same time 21 million new jobs will be added between 1986-2000, an 18-percent growth in the labor market. While the number of young entry-level workers will decline, the proportion of minority youth in the labor force will increase substantially, most markedly among non-English-speaking and black youth. This opens up tremendous opportunities for many groups who have traditionally been shut out of the labor market, but only if action is taken now to break down these barriers that make this segment of our population the least prepared for work. There is no question that our economy will need these young workers.

But unless their skills deficiencies and other problems are addressed, these youth are seriously at-risk of becoming the dependent poor of the next century.

So what is the solution? As Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin pointed out recently in testimony before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, first and foremost we need to carry forward the commitment to improve America's schools. However, as she also pointed out, education reform is an evolutionary process, and while that process unfolds, employment and training programs must help to meet the immediate needs of those young people who are seriously at-risk—working with the education system to help make sure those in school complete their education, and offering a second chance to those who have already dropped out of school.

The legislation being introduced today builds on knowledge gained by the Department of Labor after many years of experience overseeing programs serving at-risk youth. It recognizes that a highly structured, competency-based program which combines basic skills and job skills instruction is beneficial to youth who have dropped out or who are prone to dropping out of school. It acknowledges that a functional approach to such instruction—applying training to real world job market needs has proven to be successful. It recognizes the importance of a support network that includes family involvement where possible, to help youth address personal and family problems. And most importantly, it recognizes that a holistic approach to solving the problems of these young people is essential.

At-risk youth often suffer from many problems that cannot and should not be addressed through the JTPA system alone. Therefore, it is essential that any program with the goal of addressing the needs of this population build linkages across all service providers and all sectors, including education, job training, social, and health services, volunteer groups, business and labor.

In closing, I want to reaffirm that I strongly agree with the thrust of this bill, including the need to better target our resources serving disadvantaged youth. However, I do feel that any major changes such as those proposed in this legislation, particularly those changes affecting program funding, require careful study to determine their impact on the operations of existing State and local programs. Therefore I look forward to working with the administration, particularly the Department of Labor, to see this or very similar innovative legislation considered, enacted, and implemented in the future that will better enable JTPA's service to disadvantaged youth.

President Reagan, Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin, and all those who have worked in the development of this legislation are to be commended.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF AT-RISK YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING AMENDMENTS OF 1988 (PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR)

This bill would amend the Job Training Partnership [JTPA] to add an enriched program option of intensive employment and training services for at-risk youth to the present Title II-B Summer Youth Employ-

ment and Training Program and would revise the method for allocating funds under Title II-B.

The new option would allow Title II-B funds to be used for a year-round program designed to assist youth at risk of chronic unemployment. These youth often face multiple barriers to successfully entering the workforce, such as a lack of basic skills, drug and alcohol abuse, teen pregnancy, and disruptive living conditions. The new option offers a coordinated approach to assisting at-risk youth in overcoming these barriers.

Under this proposal, local areas would have the option of determining whether their needs are better met by retaining the traditional summer youth program, by operating the new at-risk youth program, or by operating some combination of these programs.

Section 1 of the bill provides that this Act shall be entitled the "At-Risk Youth Employment and Training Amendments of 1988."

Section 2 of the bill amends section 106(b) of JTPA to establish separate performance standards for the at-risk youth program. The standards are to be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor at such time as the Secretary determines enough information exists to develop meaningful standards.

Section 3 of the bill amends Part B of Title II of JTPA to add the new at-risk youth program component and to revise the method of allocating funds for programs under this part.

The bill provides a new section 251(a) of JTPA which retains the description of the purposes for the summer youth program that is contained in the present section 251. The bill adds a new subsection (b) to section 251 that describes additional purposes for the at-risk youth program, which are: (1) to provide at-risk youth with the skills necessary for entering the labor force, (2) to assist at-risk youth addressing problems which impair their ability to make successful transitions from school to work, and (3) to improve the long-term employability of at-risk youth.

The bill amends section 252 of JTPA to revise the formula for the allocation of funds for programs under this part. The current formula (which is the same formula used to allocate funds for the adult and youth programs under part A of title II) is not sufficiently sensitive to the eligible target population of economically disadvantaged and at-risk youth that are to be served by the programs under Title II-B. Under the current formula, two-thirds of the funds are allocated based on the share of total unemployment rather than on the extent or concentration of the target youth groups. In addition, summer allocations have been characterized by large annual variations due to fluctuating unemployment figures, which again do not necessarily reflect shifts in the eligible youth population. This bill would target Title II-B resources based on the relative number of economically disadvantaged youth and would stabilize year-to-year allocations.

The bill retains the present subsection (a) of section 252 that sets aside a small percentage of funds for certain areas and entities. The bill provides, in subsection (b) of section 252 of JTPA a new formula for allocating the remaining funds among States. The new formula would allot the funds on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged youth within each State as compared to the number of economically disadvantaged youth in all States.

The formula would also provide, in paragraph (2), that notwithstanding the allocation formula, no State will be allotted less than one-quarter of one percent of the total allotments, no State shall receive less than 90 percent of its allotment percentage from the previous fiscal year, and no State shall receive more than 110 percent of its allotment percentage from the previous fiscal year. These provisions would ensure funding stability and predictability, and therefore enable jurisdictions to more effectively plan their programs.

Under this section, economically disadvantaged youth are defined as individuals aged 14 through 21 who meet an income test that is based on available income information. That definition would also exclude, as appropriate and to the extent practicable, college students and members of the armed forces. The exclusion of these two groups would correct a bias in the present data that favors areas with large numbers of these two groups.

Subsection (c) of section 252 would direct the Governors to allocate funds among SDAs on the basis of the same formula used to allocate funds among the States. That subsection contains, in paragraph (2), a provision that notwithstanding the allocation formula, the governor may establish a minimum allocation for a service delivery area to ensure that maintenance of a viable program. Paragraph (2) also provides that no SDA will receive less than 90 percent or more than 110 percent of its previous fiscal year's allotment percentage unless the Governor waives either or both of these limitations. The waivers would be based on the Governor's determination that a waiver would result in the more effective utilization of funds and enhance the achievement of the program's objectives. The waivers would give the Governors greater flexibility in allocating funds to SDAs.

The bill amends section 253 of JTPA to incorporate the components of the current summer youth program into one section. The bill amends subsection (a) of section 253 of JTPA to incorporate the language of the present section 253 pertaining to the services for which funds under this section may be used, the required reading and math skills assessment of participants and the provision of basic and remedial education to summer youth program participants.

Subsection (b) of section 253 of JTPA is amended to incorporate the language relating to the program limitations which is contained in the present section 254 of JTPA. The program would, with a limited exception, be conducted during the summer months, and individuals eligible for the program are to be economically disadvantaged youth, generally aged 16 through 21, unless the SDA includes in its job training plan that economically disadvantaged youth aged 14 through 15 may also participate.

The bill amends subsection (c) of section 253 of JTPA to incorporate the language of the current section 255 describing: (1) The roles of private industry councils, chief elected officials, State Job Training Coordinating Councils, and Governors in the summer youth program; and (2) requiring SDAs to establish written goals and objectives for the program.

The bill amends section 254 of JTPA to establish the AT-Risk Youth Employment and Training Program component. Subsection (a) of section 254 sets forth that a service delivery area may, in lieu of or in addition to the summer youth program, elect to

use funds available under Title II-B for the at-risk youth program.

The bill amends section 254(b) to provide that service delivery areas operating the at-risk youth program include a description of the program in the job training plans. The description is to include the goals and objectives to be attained, activities and services to be provided, linkages established with other local agencies to provide services under the program, and strategies of demonstrated effectiveness on which the provision of services will be based or, if new strategies are to be undertaken, the design of the program that will allow a rigorous and objective evaluation of the new strategies.

The objective of these requirements is to promote adequate planning by SDAs for the kind of intensive services to be provided under the at-risk youth program. Strategies of demonstrated effectiveness are successful approaches to serving youth that have been used in youth programs on the Federal, State, or local level. The Department would circulate descriptions of examples of such programs to assist State and local planning. Where States and SDAs desire to base the program on new strategies, it is intended that the plan will describe how the new strategies will be evaluated, and that such evaluation will be based on generally accepted evaluation techniques, including where feasible, random assignment.

The bill amends section 254(c)(1) of JTPA to provide that the at-risk youth program may be conducted on a year-round basis. Section 254(c)(2) establishes the eligibility criteria for the at-risk youth program. An individual is eligible to participate in the program if: (a) The individual is aged 14-21; (b) the individual is economically disadvantaged; and (c) the individual is deficient in basic skills.

Section 254(c)(3) provides that special consideration is to be given to those eligible youth who experience severe disadvantages such as school dropouts, individuals with behavioral problems, pregnant and parenting teens, alcohol and drug abusers, handicapped youth, juvenile offenders and recipients of public assistance. In addition, section 254(c)(4) provides that up to 10 percent of the program participants may be individuals who are not economically disadvantaged if those individuals have experienced disadvantages such as those described above.

Subsection (d) of section 254 provides that the program under this section include for each participant: (1) An assessment of reading, mathematics and other basic skills; (2) development of a service strategy; and (3) basic skills assistance. A new assessment of a participant's basic skills would not be required if the results of another recent assessment are available to the program. This is the same approach taken regarding the required assessment under the current summer youth program.

In addition to these services, subsection (e) of section 254 provides that where appropriate, SDAs operating the program may use available funds to provide a variety of services targeted at in-school dropout prone youth the services may include: Combined basic and life skills instruction and work experience during the summer months; enriched basic skills and study skills training; supplemental school year activities such as counseling, mentoring, career awareness, and social group and educational activities; pre-employment and socialization skills and behavior training; and supportive services, such as child care and transportation neces-

sary to enable the participation of an individual. For school dropouts and out-of-school youths the services may include: Specialized outreach arrangements, basic skills training, including tutoring; occupational skills training, work experience, limited internships in the private-for-profit sector, and job development and placement assistance; work readiness and life skills training, counseling, mentoring, parenting education, and post-program follow-up services; and supportive services.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (e) provides that the services available to youth described in this subsection may include payments to participants including needs-based payments and work experience wages.

Section 254(f) requires SDAs operating a program under section 254 to establish linkages with local educational agencies. Such linkages are to include arrangements to ensure that the program under section 254 supplements and utilizes existing programs and services provided by local educational agencies for in-school and out-of-school youth; agreements providing that, where feasible, the local educational agencies notify SDAs operating the program when eligible youth drop out of the school system; and arrangements to provide information relating to the literacy level of participants.

Section 254(g) provides that SDAs are to establish other appropriate linkages to enhance the provision of services under the program. Such linkages may be established with local service agencies, business, labor and community organizations, volunteer groups and family members, and other training, education, employment and social service programs, including programs under JTPA title II-A.

The bill establishes a subsection (h) of section 254 of JTPA which provides that the role performed by private industry councils, chief elected officials, State Job Training Coordinating Councils, and Governors under the at-risk youth program will be the same as the roles those entities perform under part A of title II, except that private industry councils will have the additional responsibility of ensuring that the job training plan provides for the coordination of SDAs, local education agencies and other participating agencies in the planning, program design, and the provision of services to program participants.

It should be noted that, under the authority provided by section 454 of JTPA, the Department would evaluate the effectiveness of the new at-risk youth program in meeting its objectives.

The bill amends Section 255 of JTPA to provide that not more than 15 percent of funds available under part B may be used for administrative costs. This provision codifies a regulation that currently imposes a 15 percent cost limitation on the summer youth program. There would be no limitation on the percentage of funds that could be spent on supportive services under either the summer program or the new at-risk youth program. This is consistent with the current law for Title II-B. There is a percentage limitation under current law for Title II-A programs. With respect to the new at-risk youth program, it is intended that most of the funds will be spent on training and employment services rather than on supportive services. The Department would monitor the expenditures for supportive services under the program and, after some experience has been obtained, determine whether it is appropriate to establish a limit on such expenditures.

The bill revises the table of contents relating to part B of title II in JTPA to conform to the amendments made in section 3 of the bill.

Section 4 of the bill contains conforming amendments. Subsection (a) amends section 141(k) to allow funds under section 254 to be used for internships with private for-profit employers. Subsection (b) eliminates a reference to part B of title II in the current allocation formula, which will no longer apply to II-B programs. Subsection (c) changes the definition of "economically disadvantaged" in section 4 of JTPA to reflect the fact that determination of the poverty level is no longer based on criteria established by the Director of OMB but is now issued by the Department of Health and Human Services. Subsection (d) amends the definition of "State" in section 4 of JTPA to reflect that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are now the Freely Associated States (Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia) and the Republic of Palau.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the amendments made by the bill are to take effect October 1, 1988.

**LILLIAN GRAHAM—
OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZEN**

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Lillian Graham of South Point, OH.

Because of Lillian's willingness to give of her time and energy to the people of her community, she has been selected by the Lawrence County Council on Aging for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Lillian has worked diligently for the people of her community. She volunteers her free time to the Veterans Hospital in Huntington, WV, the American Red Cross, and Lawrence County Council on Aging. Moreover, she has always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of local volunteer activities.

Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Lillian and her husband, Bud, and her family for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that she will continue to share her good spirits with the people of Lawrence County, and we wish her every success in her endeavors.

**A CENTENNIAL TRIBUTE TO
TRINITY BAPTIST CHURCH**

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the 100th anniversary of Trinity Baptist Church, located in the heart of Baltimore's Seventh Congressional District. Blessed over the years with a spirited and enthusiastic con-

gregation, Trinity Baptist Church is one of the oldest surviving black Baptist churches in Baltimore. Trinity Baptist's commitment to christian enlightenment and the family of man has enabled the church to become a pillar of strength and independence within the community.

Founded in 1888 by Rev. Dr. Garnett R. Waller, who also cofounded the YMCA and NAACP in Baltimore, Trinity Baptist established its home in the old Shiloh Chapel. By 1892, the church's membership had swelled to 200 and a new edifice was erected at Oak and 23d Streets to replace the smaller chapel. Soon this complex also became too small, so the church leadership decided to purchase the Brighton building on 20th Street near Charles Street.

In 1914, Rev. James R.L. Diggs became the second pastor of Trinity Baptist. Under Reverend Diggs' leadership the congregation grew steadily and a new building was bought in 1915 and remodeled. Reverend Diggs later learned that the Lutherans were planning to vacate their property at Druid Hill Avenue and McMechen Street. The church leaders reached a satisfactory agreement with the Lutherans in February 1920, and subsequently sold the old Robert Street complex. Trinity's new home, which is her present site, was purchased and opened in May 1920.

Reverend Diggs' health began to fail and on April 14, 1923, Reverend Diggs passed away peacefully and quietly. Rev. Luke G. Reynolds served as acting pastor from 1921 to 1924 and was elected to serve from 1924 until 1929.

In May 1929, Reverend V.V.K. Stokes arrived from Norfolk, VA, to assume the duty of pastor of Trinity Baptist. Reverend Stokes will long be remembered as the pastor that led Trinity Baptist through her darkest day. Reverend Stokes was a master fund raiser and motivator. Using an innovative "calendar rally" plan Reverend Stokes strove to reduce the church's \$17,000 mortgage and managed to raise \$1,044.85 in 6 short months. During the Depression of the 1930's, when fund raising for the church was extremely difficult, Pastor Stokes implemented various new plans to raise money within the congregation.

The church caught fire on November 23, 1945. Twenty-three days later, a second fire consumed the church. Insurance coverage on the church enabled Trinity Baptist to rebuild its facility with little difficulty and with much support from local businesses. The church voted in 1949 to have Reverend Stokes serve as pastor for life. Reverend Stokes served in this capacity honorably until his death in 1961.

In July 1961, a young Harvard graduate, Herbert O. Edwards, was summoned to be Trinity Baptist's pastor. Reverend Edwards was very active during the civil rights movement and will be remembered in Trinity Baptist Church's history as a man who "championed the cause of freedom" for everybody. He served until the end of his tenure in 1967. From 1968 to 1973, Rev. Carl Washington was called to lead Trinity Baptist. Under Reverend Washington's administration an organ was bought to sustain the pipe organ.

In July 1974, Rev. William C. Calhoun became pastor of Trinity Baptist. Reverend Calhoun has seen the church's membership

increase by nearly 300 persons. New hymn books have been added, the church budget has tripled, and a quarter million dollar renovation project has just been completed.

Thanks to Reverend Calhoun and his committed congregation, Trinity Baptist has, over the last 14 years, organized several new ministries and other outreach programs. Citizens of Baltimore now enjoy Trinity Baptist Church's television and radio ministries on local stations every Sunday. Reverend Calhoun has served as president of the Progressive Baptist Convention and met with President Jimmy Carter during his years in the White House. Over the years Trinity Baptist Church has been aligned with the American Baptist Churches, U.S.A., the Progressive National Baptist Convention, Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development [BUILD] and the Central Maryland Ecumenical Council. Ministries for the collection of clothing and food for the disadvantaged and other evangelical efforts have also been established.

From the time that she was first founded through today, Trinity Baptist has remained a financially self-sufficient and caring church that is capable and willing to assist in delivering a message of hope, faith, and love.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite all of my House colleagues to join me in saluting a truly remarkable church, a beautiful congregation, and an earnest, hardworking pastor.

EXTENSION OF AN OMNIBUS TRADE BILL

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation seeking a 1-year extension of an omnibus trade bill provision suspending the customs duty on large size TV tubes. This is the shortest extension necessary to provide continuity of supply of large tubes for television manufacturers in the United States.

The duty suspension is based on the simple fact that these tubes are not currently made in the United States. At the time of its inclusion in the trade bill, the September 1988 expiration date seemed appropriate because some segments of domestic industry had assured the Ways and Means Committee that they would be in a position to manufacture large tubes here by that date. It was understood that if the September 1988 date was inappropriate because no one was engaged in domestic production, a 1-year extension would be justified on the same terms. The trade bill is only now being enacted and the suspensions about to expire. Since there is no possibility for domestic production of tubes before late 1989, it is appropriate to extend the suspension for 1 year.

Trade press reports confirm last year's finding of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee. There is no domestic production of television tubes in sizes of 30 inches or more. As TV Digest reported in February 1988, even Zenith is purchasing tubes of 30 inches or more from Japan.

To date, only Toshiba, in joint venture with Westinghouse, has announced plans to construct production facilities in the United States for the manufacture of 30-inch tubes. While every effort is being made to speed construction, the new Toshiba-Westinghouse tube production line, which represents a \$100-million investment and employment of 400 additional workers at its existing plant in upstate New York, is not projected to achieve full production until 1989. Matsushita has announced plans to begin picture tube production in the United States, but the plant won't be fully operational until fall 1989, at the earliest.

Given the projected fall startup dates for the new Toshiba-Westinghouse line and Matsushita facilities, the 1-year extension of the temporary suspension on these tubes is the shortest extension necessary to provide continuity of supply of tubes for television manufacturers in the United States.

The extension realizes the goal of the original provision, allowing U.S. manufacturers to develop the market for television containing large-size tubes while undertaking the additional investment necessary to make those tubes here.

I hope to work with the Ways and Means Committee to ensure this extension is included in the miscellaneous tariff bill being considered in committee.

EXPORTING HAZARDOUS WASTES

HON. THOMAS R. CARPER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, few of us have been immune to the debate which has swirled around the issue of hazardous waste management in this country. Next year, the tempo will pick up as we contemplate legislation to reauthorize the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA].

Our past efforts to tighten up on age-old, irresponsible waste disposal practices have had many positive results. Many corporations and municipalities are turning to waste reduction, recycling and other innovative waste management techniques to better reduce and manage their waste streams. Unfortunately, some have resorted to shortcuts which threaten the environment—not of our own country—but of lesser developed countries which do not have the resources to properly manage these gifts.

The embarrassing saga of the Islip, NY, garbage barge and the controversy raised by the city of Philadelphia's efforts to send their incinerator ash to other countries have highlighted a growing practice of exporting our wastes to less fortunate countries who either do not know what they are getting into or who are in such desperate economic straits they are mortgaging their environmental health for quick cash. It is a reprehensible practice which deserves the considerable attention it has received in the media, and now, in Congress.

I would like to submit for the RECORD an article which appeared in the July 20, 1988, issue of the Washington Report on the Hemi-

sphere, a biweekly publication of the Washington-based Council on Hemispheric Affairs [COHA]. The article, written by Tara Dunion—a research associate with COHA and a native of my State and Delaware—describes the growing problem of waste exports to our neighbors in the Caribbean and Latin America, and deserves our closest attention.

HAZARDOUS WASTE EXPORTATION PROPOSALS PROLIFERATE

(By Tara Dunion)

Plans to export incinerator ash and other hazardous wastes to the Netherlands Antilles, Peru, Mexico and Brazil surfaced recently, following the embarrassing saga of the extended voyage to nowhere of the New York "garbage barge", and illegal dumpings by the Khian Sea and the Bark, both hauling toxic incinerator ash. Countries now accepting U.S. garbage or negotiating importation of U.S. toxic waste include Dominican Republic, Peru, Guyana, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay and Brazil.

According to Greenpeace, Franklin Energy Resources of New York is negotiating with Dominican Republic officials for installation of "a recycling . . . plant generating energy based on cardboard refuse."

An estimated 100,000 barrels of waste would be exported into Peru under a plan put forth by American Security International (ASI). The garbage would include solvents, discarded lubricants, chemical sludge and other toxic wastes, amounting to approximately 66,000,000 gallons per year. Peru has expressed the greatest interest in accepting the refuse in exchange for an undisclosed payment, but talks are also occurring between the company and authorities in Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay. In addition, ASI has proposed to Lima the construction of an incinerator in the country.

The partially government-owned Guyana Resource Corporation Inc. (GRC), backed by two U.S. investor companies, Pott Industries Corporation Inc. and Teixeira Farms International Inc., is hoping to construct an incinerator in Guyana. The proposal faces growing public opposition, mainly due to the efforts of Working People Alliance (WPA) leader and parliament member, Eusi Kwayana, who challenges the project on the grounds of being hazardous to the environment. Kwayana feels the government is misleading the public regarding the safety and scope of the project.

Disposal of foreign hazardous waste is not legally permitted in Mexico following a presidential decree that allows recycling, but not disposal, of foreign hazardous wastes. But, abuses frequently occur as "sham recycling" plans are set up to allow garbage to enter Mexico under the cover of a recycling project, which later is actually dumped. A 1986 treaty regulates waste trafficking between the United States and Mexico, but neither government monitors the situation closely. The EPA relies on invoices on shipments to identify hazardous wastes, making it easy to circumvent existing regulations through subterfuge. Of the nine active refuse contracts between the U.S. and Mexico, five have not specified the waste type, amount or method of disposal in their accompanying paper, indicating that covert dumping may be occurring.

Allied Technologies also has been somewhat coy about releasing information on a proposal to ship wastes to Fortaleza, Brazil. Original plans called for the shipments to begin in July 1988, although it is unclear whether the unidentified shipments actually have occurred. The company had previ-

ously attempted to dump dioxin-contaminated wastes from Love Canal, New York in Morocco but was prevented by the reluctance of the state of New York to authorize the release of the refuse.

Waste Central's controversial proposal to build a 70-mile tourist island barrier reef composed of garbage off of Saba, the Netherlands Antilles has recently been rejected by that government. Waste Central, Inc. of Philadelphia had proposed paying \$1 to the Netherlands Antilles government for each ton of refuse which it would have been allowed to dump on the barrier reef. The growing proliferation of waste dumpings in the Caribbean Basin is due to the less stringent environmental laws in developing countries in the region and the lower waste disposal costs: approximately \$60 per ton in the United States versus a characteristic \$10-\$15 per ton in many developing countries. According to the General Accounting Office, approximately 247 million tons of hazardous wastes are produced annually in the United States, and dealing with this vast tonnage usually produces heated backlashes in domestic localities scheduled to be disposal sites, prompting private contractors to frantically look elsewhere in order to fulfill their highly lucrative multi-million dollar contracts.

Requirements for waste exportation in Washington involve four basic steps under the Hazardous Waste Control and Enforcement Act of 1983. The exporting companies must report the specifics of their shipments to the Environmental Protection Agency; they must show written documentation that receiving country consents to the project; a copy of the receiving country's approval must be attached to the shipment's invoice; and the shipment has to meet the standards of the receiving country and the contractual terms of the two countries' export agreement. This process is referred to as "informed prior consent" and it only covers hazardous shipments, since nonhazardous waste exportation is covered by the normal export procedures.

Waste incineration is becoming a popular method of disposal. No law regulates incinerator ash shipments because they are assumed to be non-hazardous, although variations in ash toxicity levels frequently occur and the conclusions drawn about a particular shipment can be skewed according to the exporters viewpoint and their readiness to fudge statistics.

Provisions in current regulations also do not take into consideration many of the overt abuses that lead to the Khian Sea's dumping 3,000 of its 15,000 tons of what turned out to be hazardous incinerator ash in Gonaives, Haiti in January 1988. The private company operating the vessel, Amalgamated Shipping Inc. of the Bahamas, listed the waste as "fertilizer" on the invoice. Government authorities—including two brothers of Col. Jean-Claude Paul—accepted the illegal shipment without an official approval, after alleged payoffs were made. The ash was then sold to farmers as fertilizer who then spread it on their fields. The EPA had erroneously assessed the ash to be non-hazardous, despite numerous environmental reports to the contrary, and the ash, therefore, did not require monitoring by the federal government.

The second ship carrying incinerator ash from Philadelphia was the Bark, operated by Bulkhandling, Inc. of Norway. Departing on February 4, 1988, the ship originally intended to unload in Haiti, but after the Khian Sea dumping, the Bark headed

toward Africa and illegally disposed its 15,000 ton cargo in the island of Kassa, off Guinea-Bissau. After the authorities became aware of what was happening, the Guinea government demanded that the Bark remove the ash. The Norwegian government has finally loaded the ash onto a second Bulkhandling-owned ship, the Banya, which is awaiting access to the Port of Philadelphia and toxicity tests on the ash.

Recently introduced legislation attempts to illegally place the burden of exploration on private companies. A bill by Senator Robert W. Kasten, Jr. (R-WI), introduced the last week of June, seeks to extend the prior informed consent requirement to non-hazardous wastes and incinerator ash. The same standards would be applied to both hazardous and non-hazardous refuse, tightening up the regulation of the frequently toxic incinerator ash.

H.R. 4902, sponsored by Rep. James J. Florio (D-NJ), sets standards for disposal, treatment and testing of incinerator ash within the United States. While the bill does not deal specifically with ash exportation, it outlines requirements for domestic ash disposal, including triple-lined landfills with ground water filter and leak detection systems. These reforms could push processing and storage costs even higher, but might encourage developing countries to adopt similar standards.

The strongest waste export bill, sponsored by Rep. John Conyers (D-MI), was introduced on July 12, 1988 and attempts to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act by prohibiting exportation of all wastes, including incinerator ash, solid, liquid, oil or hazardous wastes. The law exempts contracts signed before Jan. 1, 1988, in effect allowing the U.S.-Canadian and U.S.-Mexico agreements to stand. The bill, titled the "Waste Export Prohibition Act," is supported by many developing nations, including the Jamaican, Cape Verde and Nigerian governments, which sent embassy representatives to the July 12, 1988 press conference announcing the bill.

MARY DONLEY—OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZEN

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Mary Cahall Donley, of Brown County, OH.

Because of her willingness to give of her time and energy to the people of her community, Mary Donley has been selected by the Brown County Senior Citizens Council for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Mary has worked diligently for the Senior Citizens Center and its patrons. She worked at Brown County General Hospital for over 20 years and retired in 1980. However, Mary efforts to help other people did not end at her retirement—it appears as though it went into high gear. After retiring, Mary volunteered her services to Brown County General Hospital and works on a bimonthly basis in the hospital's gift shop. In addition, Mary has been a

member of the hospital auxiliary since its inception. She is chairperson of the Sardinia Guild of the Hospital Auxiliary.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Mary's husband of almost 50 years, Robert, and their four sons and all of her many friends are proud of her contributions. It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Mary and her family for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that she will continue to share her good spirits with the people of Brown County, and we wish her every success in her endeavors.

LOUISIANA EIGHTH DISTRICT VETERANS HONORED

HON. CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give thanks and commendation to the 46,000 veterans of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana. In particular, I wish to recognize those men and women who helped to make July 19 such a memorable day for me. On that date, I joined my distinguished colleague, Congressman GERALD SOLOMON, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in hosting special events for veterans in Rapides and Ascension Parishes. The veteran's seminar at the Veterans' Administration Medical Center in Alexandria, and the special workshop which took place in Gonzales, LA, were, to my knowledge, the first of their kind in the history of Louisiana's Eighth Congressional District.

Congressman SOLOMON gave an inspiring speech to over 350 veterans at the VA Medical Center. His deputy and chief counsel, Rufus Wilson, also touched the crowd with his moving words. Many veterans had met Rufus over the years at veterans' organization conventions, or when he was commander-in-chief of the AMVETS, or when he served as Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I also had the privilege of having with me my constituent, Larry Rivers, who is about to assume one of the most powerful elective positions in a veteran's organization, commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars [VFW]. Also serving on the panel was the Director of the VA Regional Office in New Orleans, Tony Lentini, several members of his staff and Governor Roemer's recent appointee as director of Louisiana Veterans Services, Prentice Darnell and his staff. Marlene W. Kremer represented Wisconsin Physicians Services for CHAMPUS questions and claims and Charles Freeman, the Director of the VAMC in Alexandria, served as moderator for the program.

Veterans were free to ask questions of any of the members of the distinguished panel. Their concerns ranged from VA benefits, to recent changes in laws pertaining to veterans. Significantly, they were opposed to providing payments to Japanese Americans interned in relocation camps during World War II. Likewise, those in attendance expressed their opposition to the payment of reparations to the families of those killed in the recent downing of an Iranian airbus over the Persian Gulf.

Following the question and answer period, all of the speakers mingled with the crowd, answered their specific questions, and a routine health screening for veterans was conducted.

Representative SOLOMON, Rufus Wilson, and myself, all benefited from a tour of the hospital. I want to take this opportunity to especially commend the director and staff of the VA Hospital. The excellent condition of the facility and the warm hospitality of the staff spoke for itself. The veterans are obviously well cared for and content. The rapport between hospital staff and patients is clearly excellent.

Later that evening, we traveled to Gonzales for a veteran's meeting at VFW Post 3693. I was overwhelmed at the large crowd of veterans and others—many of whom traveled long distances—who took the time and initiative to attend. Some 120 veterans and their families participated in our "mini workshop" and panel discussion. The men and women of VFW Post 3693 provided delicious cajun jambalaya and refreshments for those in attendance. They deserve and have my sincere thanks.

All in all, this was a great day for me and the veterans of the Eighth District of Louisiana. I applaud and thank my colleague Congressman SOLOMON and the other distinguished members of the panel for their assistance and outstanding presentations.

It is only fitting and proper that I include here within my formal remarks an extract from the moving address given by my distinguished colleague, U.S. Representative GERALD SOLOMON. He eloquently expressed his commitment to the brave men and women—America's veterans—who have given their time and risked their lives in order that their countrymen may enjoy the privileges and blessings of liberty. I share his commitment and loyalty to our veterans. I pledge to demonstrate it, to the best of my ability, as long as I am a Member of the U.S. Congress.

REMARKS BY HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

This Nation has a great memory, and will not forget those who labored mightily in its cause, suffered in its defense, or became disabled in its preservation.

The veterans of this Nation have been tried and tested; and they have persevered. The glory of America is the legacy they have left. The bright torch of freedom is their gift. That glory and that gift is manifest this very moment.

These are days of memories for those who wear the proud label of "veteran". They are memories of pain, glory, and honor. They are memories of the horror of war and the preservation of freedom. They are the memories we shall never forget. They are memories we must never forget—because those memories are the very reason we are the greatest, freest Nation on Earth.

But we must be wary of those who would take away that freedom—and that threat is ever present today. It is a philosophy called communism—"deadly atheistic communism."

A year and a half ago, I had an opportunity to observe the difference between democracy and communism when I led a congressional delegation to a place called Hanoi to do something I thought I would never do,

and that is to sit across the table from Communists who didn't even have the decency to return the remains of our fallen American soldiers, not to mention the possible enslavement of live American P.O.W.s.

As distasteful as it was, we were somewhat successful in that more than 80 sets of remains have been returned since those negotiations were reopened, and we hope and pray more will follow.

But while I was in Hanoi, I had an opportunity to speak to and observe many Vietnamese (some Communist and some not), but the look on their faces were all the same. It was a look of despair and no hope, because in Vietnam today (under communism) there are no decent jobs, no economy, no decent living conditions—nothing but suffering.

But by contrast, on my way back to America, I had an opportunity to visit some refugee camps on the Cambodian/Thailand border where 150,000 men, women, and children has been driven from their homes . . . by a thing called communism.

To get there, we first went by plane, then by helicopter, then by truck, and as we drove the last 50 miles along an old dirt road in the middle of nowhere, there began to be people standing alongside, first a few, then dozens, then hundreds, and later thousands.

And many were carrying signs, not like those the nightly news likes to show us that say "Yankee Dogs"—"American Pigs"—"America We Hate You."

These signs were not like that. They all said things like "USA No. 1"—"America we Love You."

And then we came upon a huge sign held by about 50 young children that said "America, please take us home". I had to step back and say to myself, "My God, how much I love my country," and how proud I am to be an American because I realized these poor people, displaced by communism, were not asking us to take them home to America, they were asking us to make it possible for them to go back to their homes, unlike the people I had seen in Hanoi, there was hope on their faces.

Their hope was America.

Yes my fellow Americans, you and I . . . we Americans are the only hope of the free world.

For if a country falls under the deadly tentacles of communism, those people have a place to turn to—a place called America.

But, my fellow Americans, if our country falls to communism, where will we go, to whom can we turn?

The answer, of course, is no one and that is why the first and most important national priority must always be a military preparedness that is without question second to none.

In recent years we have been able to rebuild our national defense, thanks to the backing of the American people.

And in the forefront of that support were the men and women we honor here today, those who proudly call themselves veterans of the armed forces of the United States of America.

God bless them. God bless those being honored here today and God bless America.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF
H.R. 5141

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have contacted me recently to cosponsor H.R. 5141, legislation I have introduced to provide a 30-day delay in the implementation of regulations requiring shrimp fishermen to pull turtle excluder devices [TED's]. The rules of the House prevent the addition of cosponsors to a bill following the filing of the committee report. Because of the short period of time between introduction of my bill and completion of committee action, these names have not been included as official cosponsors of the bill. Therefore, I am proud to have this opportunity to acknowledge their desire to cosponsor H.R. 5141.

I respectfully request the following Members be listed as supporters and cosponsors of H.R. 5141: Hon. JACK BROOKS of Texas; Hon. KIKI DE LA GARZA of Texas; Hon. TRENT LOTT of Mississippi; and Hon. MAC SWEENEY of Texas.

**ROSTENKOWSKI SPEECH
BEFORE THE NATIONAL
HEALTH CARE CAMPAIGN**

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the issue of health care is of great interest to all Members and it will be of great importance in the 101st Congress. In a recent speech to the National Health Care Campaign, the issue of health care and other social spending programs was addressed by the Honorable DAN ROSTENKOWSKI of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I believe his remarks provide a valuable perspective on this issue and I want to bring them to the attention of my colleagues. The following is the text of Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI's remarks:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DAN
ROSTENKOWSKI

I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you this morning to talk about the agenda of the 101st Congress. I'm not going to make any predictions. I learned a long time ago that predictions in Washington are always interesting and rarely correct. Instead, I'd like to discuss in more general terms the problems and choices facing us in the next Congress.

The next President and the next Congress will have to face two of the more troubling legacies of the Reagan presidency: a national debt that will exceed two trillion dollars and a social safety net that will have endured eight years of neglect. Whether by design or accident, the fiscal policy of the Reagan era, with its huge federal debt, has created a natural conflict between economic responsibility and social responsibility. The 101st Congress will have to meet the competing goals of continued deficit reduction and satisfying the pent-up demand for needed social spending.

How this conflict is resolved will effect more than just health care proposals. It will influence the debate about all public policies—defense spending, education, child care, public works, farm programs, housing and welfare—all government spending will be examined in the light of our federal deficit.

I don't raise the point about the deficit and its impact on social legislation to discourage you or to imply that needed social initiatives should not be pursued. I raise it because it is a political fact of life that has to be faced.

The experience of the past eight years gives us some indication of how the deficit will effect the public policy debate. Existing programs will face constant scrutiny, if not outright assaults. New spending programs, no matter how justifiable, will have to overcome a deep-seated, institutional resistance. And, any legislation containing new spending will have to contain spending cuts or tax increases to match the new spending.

As Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, maybe I'm more sensitive to this issue than some of my colleagues. Members of Ways and Means have to raise the taxes that pay for government programs. And believe me, no politician enjoys raising taxes.

But the Committee has jurisdiction over more than just taxes. It oversees our largest and most important social programs. So I had a good vantage point to view the ill effects of the Reagan agenda that swept through the Congress in 1981. Not only did I see the tax giveaway, I saw Social Security threatened, Medicare cut, AFDC benefits for working mothers eliminated or reduced, unemployment compensation cut back, the Social Services Block Grant reduced and Supplemental Security Benefits denied to the disabled. Ladies and gentlemen, 1981 was not a very good year.

In 1982, the Congress, led by the Committee on Ways and Means began to fight back. In 1982, we eliminated many of the tax loopholes created in 1981. In 1983, we passed a Social Security bill that preserves the solvency of the Social Security system without breaking faith with our nation's senior citizens. In 1984, we kept a recommended \$2.2 billion dollar cut in Medicare to under \$400 million dollars. That same year, we stopped the administration from throwing people off the SSI disability rolls. We also restored AFDC benefits for working mothers and enacted a major child support enforcement program.

In 1985, we exempted Social Security and a number of other Social Insurance programs from the automatic cuts under Gramm-Rudman. And once again we resisted an Administration proposal to increase Medicare Part B premiums. In 1986, we eliminated the requirement that inflation must be three percent or more before there would be a Social Security COLA. We also limited a scheduled increase in Medicare Part A deductible, saving seniors \$720 million dollars. 1986 also saw the passage of Tax Reform. Under that Act, 3 of 5 elderly households will pay no taxes in 1988 and six million working poor were removed from the tax rolls.

In 1987, we enacted important reforms to protect the pension rights of workers. We also made important changes in the SSI program to improve the quality of life for our elderly and poor disabled.

This year, we enacted the Medicare Catastrophic Health Insurance bill, which contains the largest expansion of Medicare since its original enactment in 1965. We also

have a chance to enact a major welfare reform package.

I learned a few things in these legislative battles. One, is the power of the Presidency and the importance of working with the President to accomplish as much as you can. The legislation enacted since 1981 has either been supported by the President or it has made only minor, if any, improvements in the safety net.

In cases where the President supported the bills—Tax Reform, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1983 and this year's Catastrophic Health Insurance bill—we took the President's willingness to work with us and made the bills better. In those areas where he fought us, it was trench warfare, making progress a foot at a time.

The second thing I learned was that political consensus is very difficult to achieve in an era of limited resources. It's easy to identify social needs. Balancing those needs, deciding on priorities, is another story. It is a mistake to think that the end of the Reagan Presidency means the end of this difficult task. Although we won't have to contend with his personal popularity we will have to contend with his legacy of Federal debt.

So it is against this background that the 101st Congress will confront the issue of health care. There is certainly no shortage of health care issues that must be addressed. These include improved health insurance coverage for the thirty-seven million uninsured Americans, long-term care, physician payment reform, and further refinement of the hospital DRG payment system.

There will also be continued pressure to reduce Medicare spending, either as part of a deficit reduction effort or to help finance other health related initiatives. Medicare is an attractive target for both budget cutters and spenders. In recent years we have been able to limit reductions largely to provider reimbursements rather than cuts directly affecting beneficiaries. I think this will continue to be the trend in the Committee, but we have to be careful not to reduce the quality of the care being provided.

We will continue to monitor the DRG system, making adjustments to improve its efficiency and fairness. Of particular concern to me is the need to protect inner city hospitals with large numbers of uninsured patients.

The next logical step in improving the Medicare reimbursement system is physical payment reform. There is a great deal of interest on the Committee in assuring that equitable fees are paid for primary care. This means that the current reimbursements for surgeons and other specialists will be carefully scrutinized. Any significant change in physician reimbursements will be controversial. Our task will be to get the most care of the Medicare dollar without jeopardizing the quality of the care.

In addition to these important adjustments to the current Medicare system, the Committee will be in the middle of the debate over new health programs. The recent debate over the Pepper bill focused attention on the growing need for long-term care. And the latest estimate of Americans with no health insurance is a startling thirty-seven million. Each of these issues poses tough questions about the appropriate role for government in providing health care.

The long-term care issues raises questions about home-care versus nursing home care. Which is more important? What is the appropriate mix of private insurance, govern-

ment spending and out-of-pocket costs to pay for this care? Who will provide the care?

The alarming number of uninsured Americans raises similar questions. Who will pay? What amount of care should be assured? Who should provide the care?

I think the federal government has a role to play in both of these areas. And both will be at the top of our health agenda. Addressing these issues will be technically difficult, politically controversial and very expensive.

I don't think the legislative process can address both at the same time, nor do I think we'll develop the political consensus about where to get the money for both. So which do we do first? I don't know the answer to the question. I'm not sure that you could agree on the answer.

And wholly apart from the questions of how much to spend in health care and where to spend it, how are we going to balance health care needs against the need for housing, for education, for AFDC benefits?

I don't have the answers to these questions either. But I do know that the next President will have a major role in sorting out these different priorities. The President's agenda may not always be followed but it starts the debate and it is a powerful influence on the process of establishing our national priorities.

I think that my role in this process, and the role of the Committee on Ways and Means, is pretty straightforward. I want to develop legislation that the Congress will pass and that the President will sign. I'm a legislator and a pragmatist. I don't view the legislative process as an opportunity to score political points—I want to use the process to make good law. That means compromising. It means working with the President. It means giving up some things I want and accepting some things I don't want. And more than anything else, I think it means accepting that incremental progress is preferable to no progress at all.

In closing, I will go ahead and make one prediction. Next year, in the next Congress and for the next decade, health care will be a major concern. A great deal of time will be spent in Ways and Means working on health care legislation. The Committee will need your help and the help of others in developing sound legislation. And although we may not always agree, we will always be allies in the fight for health care for all Americans. Thank you.

HONORING JACK, JOSEPH, AND MORTON MANDEL

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, Case Western Reserve University [CWRU] takes justifiable pride in its School of Applied Social Sciences [SASS]. As one of the Nation's top graduate programs, the school not only makes a substantial commitment to national research in the applied social sciences, but also sets the standard of excellence in its commitment to community.

This commitment to excellence and community reflects the attitude and fine work of Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel on behalf of Case Western Reserve University. For many years, this family has given unstintingly of

time, talents, and funds to both their community and this educational institution. A mere handful of years ago, the Mandel family provided a major contribution toward the endowment of the Mandel Center for Nonprofit Organizations, located in the SASS, but with a program which draws upon the strengths of the school of law and the Weatherhead School of Management as well.

The Mandel family is bestowing another splendid gift on SASS. This gift will allow for the construction of a new SASS building as well as a permanent endowment for the school. To recognize the continued commitment of this family, the president, the dean of SASS, and university officers have decreed that the new facility be named the "Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences."

In public acknowledgment of the many contributions to the university, a convocation will be held in honor of the Mandel family at the Allen Memorial Library on September 6, 1988. This ceremony will be a fitting tribute to the Mandel family who, in fundraising efforts, endowments, and support of every kind, has given so selflessly to CWRU.

I count it a privilege to commend Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel and their families for their years of service to Case Western Reserve University and Ohio.

E. RAY BAILEY—OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZEN

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of E. Ray Bailey of Gallia County, OH.

Because of his willingness to give of his time and energy to the community, Ray has been nominated by the Gallia County Senior Citizens Center for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Ray has worked diligently for the senior citizens center and its patrons. He has served on the board of trustees, as secretary, and personnel chairman for the center for almost 15 years. Moreover, Ray has always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of the center's efforts and local activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Ray's family and all of his many friends are proud of his outstanding achievements. It is, indeed, a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Ray and his family for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that he will continue to share his good spirits with the people of Gallia County, and we wish him every success in his endeavors.

ARCTIC WILDLIFE REFUGE AND OIL DRILLING DON'T MIX

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed a number of newspaper articles which have been submitted for the record concerning the advantages of opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development. These articles have presented only one side of the issue.

To give my colleagues a more balanced picture of the strong feelings across this country for protection of this national treasure, I wish to submit the following articles for the RECORD.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 18, 1988]

OIL DRILLING, WILDLIFE DON'T MIX, AFTER ALL

For months now, the oil industry has cited Alaska's growing caribou herds as proof that derricks, roads and wildlife are compatible. If drilling disrupts migratory patterns, this line goes, it does not harm the herds—in fact it may help them. Since oil development began around Prudhoe Bay 16 years ago, the industry says, the central Arctic caribou herd has tripled.

So why all the fuss about opening a new oil field in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which lies 100 miles east of Prudhoe Bay?

Here's why: Alaska's oilers are having a little problem with cause and effect. True, the caribou have multiplied since Prudhoe Bay was developed. The problem is, they did so because natural predators such as wolves and bears were killed or driven away as roads and air links enabled hunters to reach the area.

Conservationists have long made that point, but government officials and oil execs have hotly disagreed. The naysayers ought to feel a bit sheepish now. A preliminary report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service not only confirms the reason for increased caribou herds, it also asserts that Alaskan drilling has done considerably more damage than the feds predicted.

Near Prudhoe Bay, the vegetation lost to wildlife turned out to be almost double official expectations, the report said, and air and water pollution are significantly greater than predictions. In addition to the loss of bears and wolves, most bird species have suffered a decline. In short, "fish and wildlife habitat losses resulting from the construction, and operation of the pipeline system and Prudhoe Bay oil fields were greatly underestimated..." the report says.

The miscalculations and the damage are all the more reason for Americans to view skeptically the Reagan administration's plan to drill in the Arctic refuge. Federal bureaucrats also need to explain why the report, completed last December, was not officially released. (Its contents became known when it was leaked to the press.)

Never mind caribou. The administration seems more intent on protecting sacred cows—like the endangered Alaskan deal.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Apr. 22, 1987]

NO OIL DRILLING IN ARCTIC REFUGE

Ninety percent of the Alaskan North Slope—an expanse more than 1,000 miles long—is open to oil development. Offshore, in the Arctic Ocean, the federal government allows oil drilling in precisely 100 percent of its territory. So why on earth would Interior Secretary Donald Hodel recommend opening the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil development?

His stated reasons go like this: The oil reserves of nearby Prudhoe Bay will play out by the turn of the century. That will leave America vulnerable to extortion by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). The refuge's 1.5-million-acre coastal plain offers the best hope for a major new oil strike.

But Hodel's real reasons for urging oil rigs in the Arctic refuge are something else again. At bottom, he would risk the region's delicate ecosystem in order to satisfy the administration's ideological ties.

Never mind the development of synfuels or imposition of an oil import fee or strict conservation measures. Those are credible ways to hedge our bets against a rebounding OPEC, but Hodel and his fellow Reaganites aren't interested. They would rather let private investors have their way with public lands whose natural assets are irreplaceable.

Their proposal is plainly foolish. Even if one accepts the privateering ideology at work here, development in the Arctic refuge is a questionable proposition. The region isn't exactly Texas-style gusher country. The probability of any oil beneath the tundra is just 19 percent, and exploration has shown that chances of a major find are remote.

What if oil were discovered? Not only would it be expensive to recover, extraction would take an unacceptable toll on wildlife.

For example, porcupine caribou migrate to the coastal plain to calve and to escape insects. Conservationists say that such animals, about to give birth, would not go within two miles of an oil derrick. Nor would they cross roads or pipelines that would connect drilling sites. In all, they say oil development could reduce the population of musk-oxen and wolverines by 50 percent and porcupine caribou by up to 40 percent.

Indeed, oil development around Prudhoe Bay has caused enormous displacement of wildlife. And if caribou have survived in that area, say environmentalists, it is because hunters and poachers have killed off natural predators like wolves. That hasn't happened in the National Wildlife Refuge.

In proposing to develop part of the refuge Hodel opts for the most destructive route to energy sufficiency imaginable. In future years techniques like slant drilling and subsurface drilling may make oil development feasible there. For now, the environmental imperatives of this sensitive region should make such a project unthinkable.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, June 2, 1987]

NATION NEEDS A REAL ENERGY POLICY

Funny thing about the Reaganites: Oil import fees, energy conservatives programs and research into renewable synthetic fuels leave them cold. As another oil shortage looms, only one idea appears to carry much weight with them: Exploitation of protected lands. The administration seems ready to exercise this painful option as a first resort. It ought to be a doomsday choice.

Yet last week, Interior Secretary Donald Hodel went before Congress to advocate oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. His assessment of the problem was accurate. Today, we import 38 percent of our oil, he said, and by the year 2000 this figure could climb to 50 percent. Growing imports mean an increasing vulnerability to volatile Mideast politics.

But why turn first to policies that risk the environment? Why not first impose an oil import fee that would staunch consumption and induce domestic companies to step up production? Why not begin a stern conservation program? Why not . . .

But never mind. Hodel has his sights set on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Oh, sure, he allows, conservation is important, but it is "not a substitute for development of our own resources." He assured Members of Congress that oil exploration can be done in a way that protects the region's caribou musk oxen and other creatures.

A dose of skepticism, please. The fact is, exploration could displace caribou herds and reduce their population. It could also reduce the population of musk oxen and wolverines. Drilling machinery could leave permanent scars on the tundra.

Hodel argues that a decision to allow drilling now—before an oil panic hits—would give officials time to ensure that wildlife is not harmed. Such leeway would vanish in a crisis, he believes. But there is another possibility. In time, methods like slant drilling and subsurface drilling may make exploration feasible at minimal risk to the environment. A delay might help.

In any case, even if explorers find oil in the refuge—and that's a big if—it would not be enough to see us through a crisis. It would only trim the demand for imports. While the Reaganites push this ill-advised scheme, the nation waits on for a sensible energy policy.

[From the Macon Telegraph and News, May 18, 1988]

OIL NOT WELL IN REFUGE

There's a mindset on energy: Oil is all. When in doubt, drill. And damn the consequences.

The consequences of opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to petroleum exploration would be severe damage to one of the continent's last surviving stretches of coastline unsoiled by human development. Yet, there's a good chance it's going to happen. A House committee has already given its stamp of approval. We hope wiser heads prevail.

The plan is being pushed in the name of the nation's long-term need for energy resources. Its proponents are the same folks who opposed automotive fuel-efficiency standards that might have resulted in fuel conservation that could have saved enough fuel to offset the need for resources gained by exploiting the Arctic refuge. Nor did the advocates express any interest in a proposal to require an in-depth analysis of energy alternatives before sending drillers into the wilderness.

The scheme deserves to hit the skids somewhere on its way through the legislative process before it gets beyond retrieval. What's cooking here is no long-term concern for energy (the wells will eventually run dry) but another needless rush to turn over any rock that might produce more oil.

Fossil fuel is a non-renewable resource. So is the pristine beauty of nature. We need a lot more balanced debate on alternative measures before making another blind as-

sault on another one of our natural treasures.

[From the Virginia Pilot and Legend-Star, May 22, 1988]

ALASKAN OIL FOLLIES

Among the battles the Reagan administration has chosen to fight in its last months is an all-out push to open Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil and natural-gas drilling. Why? Because of what it can see and what it cannot see.

What it can see is that domestic oil production is declining, as more and more U.S. oil fields become played out. This situation is serious, and will get worse, opening the way for (1) ever-increasing oil imports, with their accompanying drain on the U.S. balance of payments, and (2) greater threats to the national economy in case of shortfalls or embargos. Clearly the nation's long-term energy needs are not being adequately met.

What the administration cannot seem to see—though it should be obvious to one and all, and was obvious before the fact—is that this depletion of U.S. oil supplies was aggravated by the Reagan administration's so-called energy policy of drill, waste and explore for more.

For more than seven years, this administration has ridiculed and obstructed an array of sensible energy initiatives, slashing funding for solar- and wind-power research and development, allowing Japan to overcome the early U.S. lead in cutting the cost of photovoltaics (solar cells that produce electricity directly from sunlight), lowering fuel-efficiency standards for automobiles, etc. President Reagan even vetoed a bill to label household appliances by energy efficiency—even though the manufacturers approved of it.

As a result, the gains the United States made in energy efficiency under the spur of the Arab embargos and price-hikes of the 1970s have been eroded. And so U.S. consumption is heading up, even while production is heading down. Could any such policy produce a more predictable result? And now the administration is on its drill, waste and explore kick again—this time in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Unfortunately, the administration's attempt to open the refuge to oil and natural-gas drilling got an assist from an unexpected quarter earlier this month when the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to send the ANWR bill to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Environmentalists opposing the bill were badly beaten: Not only were their preferred substitutes voted down, but the bill passed with the support of a majority of the committee's Democrats. Among those supporting the bill were Rep. Owen Pickett, who represents Virginia Beach and Norfolk, and committee chairman (and sponsor) Rep. Walter Jones, who represents northeastern North Carolina.

Clearly, the committee's Democrats weren't looking for a chance to give the administration a boost. So why vote to open up the refuge? Apparently for three reasons: one predictable, one debatable, one highly interesting.

National economic or military needs.—Some felt that if oil is found at the refuge—current geological speculation sets the odds at 19 percent—the nation will need it, whatever energy-policy flaws created the need.

The bill's safeguards.—Drilling at the refuge would take place under much stiffer ground rules than at nearby Prudhoe Bay.

But the wisdom of relying on environmental-impact statements before the fact and rigorous enforcement of standards thereafter is at least questionable in light of recent reports demonstrating that the adverse environmental impact of oil drilling at Prudhoe Bay has been greater than previously admitted.

Money.—This reason is the most interesting, if little publicized.

Under the Refuge Revenue Sharing Act of 1935, localities are supposed to receive an annual reimbursement, in lieu of taxes, for land included in the national wildlife refuge program. In recent deficit-plagued years, the federal government has been forking over only 56 percent of what its own formula says it owes. As a consequence, it becomes ever harder to persuade localities to cooperate in establishing additional refuges.

The Jones bill would dedicate 45 percent of any potential oil revenues to Fish and Wildlife programs. So, if the drillers should strike oil, the Fish and Wildlife Service would receive gushers of cash. The most dedicated environmentalists are likely to have second thoughts, when confronted with the prospect of cash in large amounts to fund an objective—wildlife conservation—they very much believe in.

The Reagan administration has never seen a landscape it didn't think an oil derrick could improve; it would be ironic if its attempt to open another pristine area to drilling is aided by the mixed motives of those with whom it shares few emotions other than mutual contempt.

[From the Lexington (KY) Herald-Leader, Apr. 24, 1987]

ADOPT A REAL ENERGY POLICY BEFORE PLUNDERING ALASKA

U.S. Interior Secretary Donald Hodel says the nation needs to avoid becoming dangerously dependent on foreign energy supplies. How right he is! So what does Hodel propose to do to avert a repeat of the 1970s energy crisis?

Has he got in mind a national energy policy—a phrase that has disappeared from the English language under the Reagan administration?

Does he want a return of energy tax credits and other conservation measures popular a decade ago?

Is the country ready to impose an oil import tax, perhaps using the extra cash on a crash program to develop alternative energy sources—solar, oil shale, coal conversion?

Has he (gasp!) found the secret to ensuring safety in nuclear energy?

Unfortunately, the answer is, "none of the above." All Hodel has in mind is turning oil companies loose on the entire 1.5 million acre coastal plain in Alaska's Arctic National Refuge. He says the area is the best hope for a major new on-shore oil strike in the United States.

That may be true, since the area lies within 100 miles of the giant Prudhoe Bay oil field. Still, it's hard to accept at face value Hodel's sudden fear of a rerun of gasoline lines. Not when the Reagan administration has consistently ignored the need for a national energy policy.

If such a policy were in place, if this nation were doing everything in its power to achieve energy independence, Hodel's argument would carry far more weight. But given this administration's record, on both energy and business, Hodel's sudden conversion to energy conservationist doesn't ring true. It sounds more like a pretext for let-

ting the oil industry get richer at the expense of a wildlife refuge.

As part of a coherent and comprehensive national energy policy, a case can be made for opening up this 1.5 million acres to oil exploration. Without such a policy, the environmental damage can't be justified.

[From the Raleigh (NC) News & Observer, Nov. 26, 1986]

OIL DRILLING, WILDLIFE DON'T MIX

James Watt, wherever he is, must be bursting with pride that the Reagan administration persists in trying to trash the environment it is entrusted with protecting.

The Department of the Interior's proposal to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for oil and gas drilling—a proposal that comes from the Fish and Wildlife Service, no less—is a shocking reminder that Watt's exploitative philosophy thrives long after this departure as interior secretary. And it illuminates the administration's misguided energy policies.

The wildlife refuge covers the northeasternmost reaches of Alaska, far above the Arctic Circle. To conjure up a mental picture of the vast snowscape leading down to the Arctic Sea, think of it as a polar version of the better-known Serengeti Plain in Africa, a treasure house of the animal kingdom.

The refuge sustains the continent's largest remaining herd of migratory caribou, which journey each year to their coastal calving grounds. All the host of arctic creatures—polar and grizzly bears, wolves and foxes, musk oxen, countless birds—carry on within the refuge that timeless struggle for survival to which man remains a relative newcomer.

Leasing tracts within the refuge for oil and gas drilling would threaten this complex, fragile ecosystem in many ways. Roads and pipelines would block the caribou's migratory paths. Air and water pollution would increase dramatically. Once the caribou herd began to decline, other wildlife that depend on the caribou also would suffer, and the natural balance of an entire region would be altered, perhaps beyond repair.

The Interior Department claims that Alaska's northern coastal plain holds huge petroleum deposits, perhaps rivaling those of adjacent Prudhoe Bay. It says production in the Prudhoe field has peaked and warns of continued reliance on foreign sources of oil. Yet the administration spurns energy conservation measures and energy taxes that could reduce the demand for oil imports. Instead, it volunteers to sacrifice one of the nation's environmental crown jewels.

The drilling proposal faces scrutiny by Congress; where there is considerable support for giving Alaska's coastal plain special protection as wilderness. Even though the administration shirks its duty, lawmakers thus still can carry out the federal responsibility to safeguard one of the few, precious areas in the United States where man's disruptive impact has yet to be felt and life continues to be governed by age-old natural laws.

[From the Chattanooga Times, Tuesday, May 17, 1987]

PROTECT "AMERICA'S SERENGETI"

In trying to secure congressional approval for oil development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the Reagan administration has often cited experience at nearby Prudhoe Bay, saying it shows that concerns

about potential environmental damage in the refuge are overblown. But a draft report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that came out last week shows something else.

The Fish and Wildlife Service study compared actual environmental damage to what was predicted in federal environmental impact statements on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and the Prudhoe Bay operations. It found the projects have created substantially more air and water pollution and have destroyed significantly greater amounts of wildlife habitat than had been anticipated. The findings should give congressional supporters of oil development in the arctic refuge serious second thoughts.

The Fish and Wildlife study, requested a year ago by Rep. George Miller, D-Calif., was completed in December but has not yet been officially released. Officials say that's because some within the agency dispute the validity of its results. But Rep. Miller, who secured a copy of the draft report through unofficial channels, is reasonably suspicious. He charged that the Interior Department deliberately suppressed the report for fear its findings would dampen congressional enthusiasm for oil leasing in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

This vast wilderness is now protected from industrialization, but the pressure to remove barriers to oil development are great. Legislation to do so has already passed some committees in the House and the Senate but continues to face strong opposition, and for good reason. Because of the large numbers and varied species of wildlife it sustains, the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has been called "America's Serengeti." It is a unique and priceless natural resource that can never be replaced and should not be casually sacrificed.

Those pushing for that sacrifice argue that development is necessary to lessen U.S. dependence on foreign oil. But given the most optimistic scenario, the output from the refuge would provide only 2 percent of the nation's projected oil demand during the life of the field. America could easily save that much oil by strengthening energy conservation programs, through tougher automobile mileage standards for instance. Moreover, even the Interior Department admits there is only a 19 percent chance that any recoverable oil reserves will be discovered in the refuge, and that the economics of recovery would demand oil prices of \$33 a barrel—twice the current rate.

The facts simply do not support the case for turning the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge over to the oil companies. The coastal plain of the refuge is the only stretch of Alaska's 1,600-mile Arctic coast that's not yet open to oil development. It is not too much to ask that this last bit of coastal wilderness be protected—for the sake of the environment, the wildlife and future generations of Americans.

[From the Chattanooga (TN) Times, Apr. 28, 1987]

DRILL, AND HANG THE CONSEQUENCES?

Interior Secretary Donald Hodel has asked Congress to allow drilling for oil under the 1.5 million acres of Alaska's Arctic coastal plain, part of the 19 million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, even though the Interior Department concedes that the odds of success are less than 20 percent. The likelihood is considerably greater that oil and mineral exploration on the plain will damage irreversibly the land used,

among other things, as calving grounds by the great herds of caribou. That's serious enough, but Mr. Hodel's request also suggests the short-sightedness of the administration's energy policy.

The primary rationale in Mr. Hodel's proposal is that the United States must come up with new domestic oil sources, thus reducing our dependence on imported oil. The problem is that such an approach downplays the fact that oil reserves are not infinite. The government's lack of emphasis on conservation and the development of alternative energy sources demonstrates a regrettable lack of foresight. The security of America's future depends in large part on an energy policy more comprehensive than the one advanced by Mr. Hodel and others in the administration.

There are more problems with the coastal plain proposal than its relationship with the nation's energy policy, however. In designating the area as a refuge, Congress intended for it to be a place where wildlife could be protected. Drilling would disrupt both the refuge concept and the plain's environment as well.

Further inland, where drilling has been permitted on Alaska's North Slope, more than 17,000 oil spills have been reported there over the past 13 years. The spills have permanently ruined vegetation in the immediate area. The Interior Department had predicted, in fact, that exploration for oil there would result in an "unquantifiable loss of wilderness values" coupled with a population decline of caribou. Those animals and others would also be adversely affected by disruptions in habitat and food sources. There is no reason to assume that the effect would be any less great on the Arctic coastal plain.

Mr. Hodel's proposal that drilling be permitted on the coastal plain's pristine wilderness demonstrates an insensitivity to environmental concerns unworthy of a public official. Congress' responsibility—to the public, to the wilderness program and indeed to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—is clear.

[From the Chattanooga Times, Dec. 30, 1986]

PROTECTING A NATIONAL TREASURE

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge stretches over 19 million acres in the northeast corner of Alaska. It is a vast and wild area, where caribou and polar bears, muskoxen and grizzlies, wolves and sheep, arctic foxes and million of birds find habitat and safety. But the refuge and its inhabitants are threatened by those who dream of oil wells and pipe lines.

In November, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service proposed that the entire coastal plain of the refuge be opened to oil and gas development, with all the destructive intrusion of people, machines and man-made pollution that entails. The agency's report reflects the Reagan administration's misguided but consistent policy of promoting commercial exploitation of the nation's natural resources regardless of the costs.

It suggests that as much as 9.2 billion barrels of oil could be recovered from the area, but buried in the report—and not mentioned in the executive summary or news releases on it—are calculations of the real chances of finding oil and gas there. They are a mere 19 percent. And resource recovery from this arctic coastal plain would be economically feasible only if the price of oil on the world market rises to more than double what it is today. In light of these un-

heralded facts, commercial oil development in this wilderness area would be of questionable wisdom, even without environmental considerations. But these considerations are great.

The coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the calving ground for migratory herds of Alaskan caribou, whose wanderings were described by one writer as "the most thrilling wildlife spectacle in this realm of outsized wonders." Polar bears make their dens along the coast. And muskoxen, just recently reintroduced on the refuge a century after overhunting had eliminated them, are flourishing along the coast, where they live year-round.

Even the Fish and Wildlife Service's report acknowledges the extraordinary importance of the coastal plain, describing it as "the most biologically productive part of the arctic refuge and the center of wildlife activity on the refuge." It should not be sacrificed to development interests but should be protected by designation as a wilderness area, as the balance of the refuge has been.

Destroying the fragile ecological balance of this haven for wildlife for the sake of oil and gas recovery, which may or may not be possible or financially feasible, would be a travesty. The Wilderness Society's Susan Alexander likened it to "melting down the Statue of Liberty for the copper in its body and the gold in its torch." The coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is as much a national treasure as the statue whose 100th birthday we celebrated with such fanfare last summer. We should show it equal respect.

ROTARY CLUB OF JOLIET—75 YEARS OLD

HON. JACK DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for three quarters of a century, the Rotary Club of Joliet, IL, has been standing tall as a pillar of the community of Joliet. On Saturday, August 27, 1988, the Rotary Club of Joliet will be celebrating the 75th anniversary of its founding, and I would like to take this opportunity to share their celebration of accomplishment with you and our colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

In 1913, Rotary Club No. 78 was founded in Joliet, IL. The number, seventy-eight, means that the Joliet Club was the seventy-eighth club founded in this worldwide organization now consisting of more than 22,000 clubs in 161 countries across the globe. The Joliet club is now almost 150 members strong.

Undoubtedly most of us have been touched by the benefits of a Rotary Club in our home districts and hometowns. In Joliet, families of all sizes, baseball players, runners, frisbee throwers, and many others all owe thanks to the Rotary Club for their efforts that resulted in the community sports field. Also, young men and women in the Joliet community ages 18 to 28 are able to learn the value and feel the reward of community activity through the Rotaract Club, sponsored by the Rotary.

This, of course, is only the tip of a mountain of good done by the Rotary Club. The Rotarians have promoted scholarships, raised funds for charity, and are currently waging a world-

wide campaign with the ultimate goal of wiping out polio once-and-for-all.

I am, at the same time, both proud of and thankful for the Rotary Club of Joliet. I wish them the best on their 75th anniversary, and hope that their work continues for many decades into the future.

LOW-INCOME HOUSING REVITALIZATION ACT

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Low-Income Housing Revitalization Act, which seeks to halt the serious decline in available low-income rental housing now taking place all across our Nation.

The Low-Income Housing Revitalization Act amends current tax law to provide attractive incentives to private investors who are willing to rehabilitate, renovate, or construct low-income housing units. These incentives are intended to bring private investment capital into a marketplace where renovation, rehabilitation, and construction of low-income housing have come to a virtual standstill.

Under the Low-Income Revitalization Act, the current tax law would be amended to do the following: First, the bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to reallocate unused housing tax credits among other States for use by their housing credit agencies during the following year.

Second, the legislation permits a housing tax credit allocated for a low-income housing project in 1 year to be carried over to the following year, if it is reasonable to believe the project is likely to be placed into service during the subsequent year.

Third, the bill extends the availability of low-income housing credits beyond the current expiration date of 1989. Under the provisions of the Low-Income Revitalization Act, federally subsidized low-income rental property, which was previously eligible to be depreciated at rate of 4 percent, would be depreciated at a higher rate of 9 percent.

Fourth, the legislation modifies current tax law by accelerating depreciation of qualified low-income rental housing from 27.5 to 20 years.

Fifth, while enhancing tax credits for investors, the bill would deny any Federal tax credit or deduction to owners who maintain substandard low-income rental housing. The bill specifies that no tax credit or deduction can be claimed by owners of substandard property found to be in violation of local or State housing or building codes—unless the violations have been corrected within a given period of time. This provision of the legislation is modeled after the Substandard Housing Abatement Program, a highly successful program in my own State of California, which became law in 1974.

Finally, the legislation modifies the current passive loss rules to permit investors who are actively or materially involved in renovating, rehabilitating, or constructing low-income rental housing to write-off losses incurred as a

result of such involvement against other income.

Mr. Speaker, the accelerating decline of affordable, safe, and decent low-income rental housing is one of the great tragedies in America today. Since 1983, fewer than 25,000 units have been built annually. Consequently, no matter where one looks these days, growing numbers of homeless people—young and old, black and white, families and individuals—can be seen.

I am deeply concerned about two unprecedented crises—the dearth of affordable, decent and safe low-income rental housing, and homelessness—that touch each and everyone of us. I believe that the Low-Income Housing Revitalization Act would encourage new investment in low-income rental housing, particularly as the dwindling supply and availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing continues to be a critical issue throughout our Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REGARDING CERTAIN HOSPITALIZED VETERANS

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will operate to prevent the reduction of certain veterans' VA pension benefits where the veteran is hospitalized for periods in excess of 3 full calendar months.

Under current law, if a veteran with no dependents is being furnished hospital care by the VA for a period that exceeds 3 calendar months, his or her non-service-connected VA pension benefits are reduced to a maximum of \$60 per month until such time as the veteran is discharged from the hospital. I have received reports that this reduction in benefits is causing hardships to some of these needy veterans who, although hospitalized and maintained by the Government, still have other monetary obligations, such as the rental of a home.

This bill would also remove an administrative burden from the VA which must now monitor these cases and take action both to reduce and subsequently increase these payments. I do not believe the current provisions are needed, and since the pension program is one which is based on economic need, we will not be providing any veteran a windfall if this bill is enacted.

CARRIE BROOKINS—OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZEN

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Carrie Brookins of Jackson, OH.

Because of Carrie's willingness to give of her time and energy to the people of her community, she has been selected by the Jackson County Senior Citizens for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Carrie has worked diligently for the Senior Citizens Center and its patrons. She helps her elderly neighbors with mowing their lawns throughout the summer. In addition, Carrie takes elderly neighbors to church and other social events who would otherwise miss these functions.

Carrie serves on a special events committee at the Senior Citizens Center that plans and coordinates all fundraisers and special dinners. Moreover, she has always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of the center's efforts and local activities.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Carrie and her family for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that she will continue to share her good spirits with the people of Jackson County, and we wish her every success in her endeavors.

THE UNITED STATES-CANADA FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday when this body overwhelmingly approved the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement, I argued that if the agreement should fail in Canada, that there should be no solace taken. Instead, it is unlikely that we could easily return to the status quo or soon negotiate a new trade agreement or some multiple number of sectoral arrangements.

This is due to the fact that the United States and Canada—having come so far over so many years, having raised expectations so much, and having negotiated so closely—have become more aware of each other's trade practices, which we both deem to be unfair in a good many instances. Therefore, if the agreement should fail, I believe that it is almost inevitable that an avalanche of trade complaints would be filed, resulting in a virtual trade war between our two countries that could have calamitous consequences for both the United States and Canada, and the world.

These same points are cogently presented in an article in the Toronto Globe and Mail on August 10, 1988. I would like to share this article with all of you because I believe that the points in this article are well-taken and should be carefully considered by all.

The article follows:

IF THE DEAL IS SCUTTLED

"Always remember, a 50-percent loss requires a 100-percent gain to get back to where you started," writes Royal Trust investment adviser Paul Bates.

With a sound free trade agreement reached with the United States, and ratification likely this month by the Congress and House of Commons, the cost of tearing up the deal this winter would be significant. No worse signal could go out to Canadian

and foreign entrepreneurs. No greater comfort could come to U.S. protectionists. No sadder blow could land on important regional groupings in Canada's political landscape.

And having provoked these losses, how much harder would we have to work to get back to where we started?

The free trade agreement is already a tangible and psychological fact. The world beyond Canada would be amazed and largely contemptuous of Canada's rejection of this agreement now. No other country has won such privileged access to the largest, richest market in the world. No other country has won U.S. agreement to subject the United States' trade laws to joint discipline. No other country has won exemption from future U.S. laws against foreign investment.

And no other industrialized country has travelled from protectionism to a free trade agreement, only to call it off and retreat to protectionism. It would darken recently-improved views of Canada for years. (Other than Japan and the U.S., which have huge internal markets, Canada is the only industrialized country that is not in a free trade group. In this context, Canada is the most protectionist industrialized country in the world.)

It is whistling Dixie north of Windsor to suggest that Canada could tear up this agreement now and make another one with the United States soon. No U.S. administration is going to start over to seek essentially the same ends after such a rebuff. Let us not parade our naiveté so conspicuously, or offer comforting assurances so disingenuously.

It is just as irresponsible to suggest that tearing up the deal will not discourage investment here by Canadians as well as by foreigners. Securities dealers report that many business decisions are on hold, awaiting the outcome of the political battle in Canada. No one should pretend that rejecting this free trade agreement would not damage Canada's economic prospects and lead to higher unemployment than would otherwise occur. No one should pretend that rejecting this deal would not expose the auto pact to early renegotiation in much tougher circumstances.

And what about the political implications? Eight premiers support this deal. The aspirations of many Westerners and Quebecers, in particular, are caught up with free trade. The Macdonald commission on the economy suggested in 1985 that "the most significant and long-term effect of free trade would be the strengthening of national unity and the removal of one of the most persistent and corrosive sources of regional alteration in Canada's political history . . . It is difficult to think of any other act of Canadian public policy that would have so comparably healing an effect."

The corollary is obvious. Rejecting a signed free trade agreement would pour vinegar on historic wounds. And separatists would quickly suggest to Quebecers that only sovereignty can remove the protectionist yoke imposed by others on its future (while Ontario booms with free trade in autos).

In a desperate struggle with the New Democrats for electoral advantage, the weakened federal Liberals have abandoned their historic tendencies toward free trade to embrace protectionism. Surely it is only descriptive to say that economic dismay and political disarray would greet any federal government that rejected this useful agreement, whatever the outcome of an election expected this fall.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON HUMAN RESOURCES

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with my esteemed colleagues, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL and Representatives MEL LEVINE and CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, a joint resolution for the establishment of a National Commission on Human Resources.

I firmly believe that there is a role for Government to assist in research and education on techniques that promote the development of personal excellence and fuller human potential. To this end, the National Commission on Human Resources will work to establish a scientific advisory panel to promote the evaluation of technologies and procedures to develop fuller human potential. The Commission will also advise Congress, the President and the American public on policies and programs designed to facilitate the attainment of fuller human potential.

Mr. President, this century will unfortunately go down in history as one characterized by war, hunger, and genocide—as a century where man's inhumanity to man surfaced decade after decade. No one more than we, who are products of this century, can better understand human potential for evil. It is with this in mind that I call your attention to the charter of the National Commission on Human Resources. It is a charter that calls for the exploration of potential for good, for the realization of noble goals.

As the language in this bill explains, the exploration of human potential is really a pursuit of ways to solve the problems that separate people, to strengthen world peace, security, tolerance, and fundamental human rights. It is the search for methods to promote economic and social progress and well-being for all peoples. By identifying the tolls and techniques for attaining fuller potential for individuals, the Commission will provide the American people with the knowledge, the opportunity and the discipline to promote personal excellence.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important measure.

PRIME MINISTER OF MALTA VISITS THE UNITED STATES

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in July the Prime Minister of Malta, Dr. Edward Fenech Adami, visited the United States. Dr. Fenech Adami was the first Maltese Prime Minister to visit this country in 20 years. He has traveled to the United States before on several occasions in his capacity as opposition leader.

The primary reason for this visit is Dr. Fenech Adami's desire to underscore his interest in establishing closer ties to the United States and to the West. While Malta retains its neutrality, the Prime Minister is interested in

pursuing a more balanced policy toward the East and West than that of previous Maltese Governments.

During his visit the Prime Minister met with President Reagan, Vice President BUSH, Deputy Secretary of State Whitehead, Assistant Secretary for European and Canadian Affairs Ridgway, and Secretary of Commerce Verity. In addition, Dr. Fenech Adami met with a number of private groups and members of the media. In candid discussions with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Prime Minister reiterated that Malta wants to establish stable relations with its neighbors, the United States, and the West while adhering to Malta's neutral foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Malta has indicated it will seek membership in the European Community. The Prime Minister affirmed that Malta needs technical assistance and Western private investment to rebuild its economic base and reconstruct its long neglected infrastructure. Because Malta is interested in pursuing a more balanced policy toward the East and the West and is determined to restore the traditional friendly ties and expand economic relations between our two countries, I urge my colleagues and the administration to lend their support to this effort.

THE HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1988

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I introduced legislation along with Congressman PETE STARK, the chairman of the Health Subcommittee, to address what I believe is becoming a serious problem with hospitals in this country which refuse to acknowledge their responsibility to those individuals who do not have adequate access to health care.

I am referring to hospitals which refuse to accept Medicaid patients or hospitals which refuse to accept patients who do not have health insurance. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, the primary role of a hospital is to care for sick people. But when access to care is denied because a patient is incapable of paying for services, especially by a hospital which receives enormously generous benefits from the Federal Government, it's time for Congress to step in.

A study reported in the Milbank Quarterly showed that 15 percent of for-profit hospitals surveyed discouraged admission of Medicaid patients, 5 percent of private nonprofit hospitals discouraged admission, and 3 percent of public hospitals discouraged admission. Even worse are the statistics for hospitals which discourage admission of uninsured patients: 43 percent of for-profit hospitals, 20 percent of private nonprofit hospitals, and 14 percent of public hospitals.

The Health Care Providers Responsibility Act of 1988 has two main provisions, but its overriding purpose is to provide that when a health care facility receives proceeds from a tax-exempt bond, or when a health care facility

is a qualified Medicare provider, the health care facility is required to accept Medicaid patients. Although I think this bill should go further—and will continue to pursue attempts to make it go further—I am introducing this bill today to send a message that hospitals have a responsibility to their community when they receive benefits from the taxpayers of this country.

A more detailed explanation of the legislation follows:

AMENDMENTS TO TAX-EXEMPT BOND RULES

PRESENT LAW

Condition of bond exemption

Interest on obligations of State and local governments is exempt from Federal income tax under authority of section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code. In the case of a private activity bond (i.e., a bond where proceeds are used to finance private activities), interest on the bond is taxable unless a specific Code provision operates to exclude the interest from taxation.

One such exception is provided for "qualified 501(c)(3) bonds" (Code sec. 145). A bond is a qualified 501(c)(3) bond generally if the proceeds of the issue are used by an organization exempt from tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code or by a governmental unit. Other requirements are also imposed on general obligation bonds and qualified private activity bonds (see, for example, Code sections 147 and 149).

Application of unrelated business income tax

Under present law, if there is a change in the use of facilities financed in whole or in part with proceeds from a tax exempt private activity bond, several adverse consequences result. In the case of qualified 501(c)(3) bonds, a change in use can result in the 501(c)(3) entity becoming subject to the unrelated business income tax.

Code section 150(b)(3) subjects these entities to the unrelated business income tax if facilities owned by these entities, financed with proceeds of tax exempt bonds, are used in a trade or business by a non-exempt person. In addition, no deduction for interest on financing provided by tax-exempt bonds is allowed for entities which become subject to the unrelated business income tax under this section.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISION

Condition of bond exemption

Under the bill, interest on an "inpatient health care facility bond" would not be exempt from tax unless, at the time the bond was issued, the facility receiving proceeds from the bond was a qualified Medicaid provider in the State in which the facility was located. An "inpatient health care facility bond" is a private activity bond, any proceeds of which are used by or on behalf of an inpatient health care facility. The term inpatient health care facility includes, but is not limited to, hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and intermediate care facilities. The bill is also intended to cover services provided in a hospital emergency room.

It is anticipated that the Secretary will monitor the activities of hospitals which have provider agreements and receive proceeds from inpatient health care facilities bonds closely. For example, if a hospital had a provider agreement, but discouraged admission of Medicaid patients, or attempted to discharge these patients against their will, the Secretary would be expected to

notify these hospitals that such actions were inappropriate as a condition of receiving the benefits of tax exempt financing. Such actions by hospitals might well subject the hospitals to loss of a provider agreement under many State Medicaid laws, thus subjecting the hospitals to the unrelated business income tax (as discussed below).

Unrelated business income tax provisions

Under the bill, interest on a general obligation bond would not lose its exemption from Federal income tax if proceeds from that issue were provided to an inpatient health care facility which violated the Medicaid standards discussed above. This is because, in the case of general obligation bonds, it is possible that only a fraction of the proceeds would be lent to an inpatient health care facility within the meaning of the bill. A decision was made that it was inappropriate to taint the entire bond issue if only a small fraction of the proceeds were made available to an offending facility, or if it were impossible to trace the proceeds to such a facility.

Nonetheless, inpatient health care facilities which receive proceeds from a general obligation bond are still required to be Medicaid providers. Similar to the rules governing facilities financed under 501(c)(3) bonds which are used by a person other than a 501(c)(3) organization or governmental unit, the bill subjects the facility to the unrelated business income tax. Thus, if financing from a general obligation bond were provided to any inpatient health care facility from a bond which purported to be a tax exempt bond, and the facility did not meet the requirement specified above relating to being a Medicaid provider, then the owner of the facility would be subject to the unrelated business income tax imposed by Code section 511. The unrelated business income tax would be imposed in any year in which the facility failed the test relating to Medicaid.

The provisions relating to the unrelated business income tax would also apply to an inpatient health care facility which received financing from an inpatient health care facility bond and which violated the Medicaid standard. Thus, interest on bonds would not lose income tax exemption, but the offending facility would become subject to the unrelated business income tax sanction for the taxable year (or years) in which the facility did not have a provider agreement under the State's Medicaid program. Furthermore, any deduction for interest on bond financing which would arise as a result of the facility becoming liable for the unrelated business income tax would be disallowed.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The provision would be effective for bonds issued after December 31, 1988.

AMENDMENTS TO MEDICARE PROGRAM

PRESENT LAW

Present law does not require hospitals or skilled nursing facilities to accept Medicaid patients as a condition of participation in the Medicare program.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISION

Under the bill, a hospital or skilled nursing facility would be ineligible to participate in the Medicare program unless it was a qualified provider in the State Medicaid program in the State in which the facility is located. The provision would be effective for hospital cost reporting periods beginning on or after September 15, 1988.

CHESTER AND MARY NEFF— OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Chester and Mary Neff of Scioto County, OH.

Because of their willingness to give of their time and energy to the people of their community, Chester and Mary Neff have been nominated by the Minford 55 Club for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizens Award.

Chester and Mary have worked diligently for the Senior Citizens Center and its patrons. They have served as volunteers for the center for several years. Chester is the director, and Mary has treated the patrons of the center with her fine cooking. They have always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of the center's efforts and local activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Chester and Mary's family and all of their many friends are proud of their outstanding achievements. It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to them for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that they will continue to share their good spirits with the people of Scioto County, and we wish Chester and Mary every success in their endeavors.

DECISION TIME FOR THE B-1B

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosures about the glaring deficiencies in the B-1B bomber have raised serious questions about its future and the ability of our national security establishment to effectively manage important defense programs.

One basic point needs to be emphasized: Fiscal year 1990 is the make-or-break year for the B-1B.

Why do I say this? The problems that have been uncovered with the B-1B's defensive avionics system, the ALQ-161A, cannot be denied or simply explained away. It has been determined that a fundamental flaw exists with the basic architecture of the system. That is, the ALQ-161A cannot process all of the threats that it is supposed to. This means that the B-1B's ability to detect and counter certain threats is compromised. For a penetrating bomber such as the B-1B whose survivability is very sensitive to the performance of its electronic countermeasure system this raises serious questions about its capability.

These questions must be answered before we do another thing with the B-1B. We need very precise answers to very basic questions. We must know exactly how much it is going to cost to fix the problems and what we achieve in terms of the B-1B's mission capability. Further, what do we do with the B-1B if we don't

fix the very serious shortfalls with the electronic countermeasure system?

We must know what enhancements the Department of the Air Force has in mind for the B-1B. And we must know the total costs and what we accomplish with the enhancements. This information must be presented in comprehensive fashion, not in a piecemeal manner.

In this vein, I have written to the Secretary of Defense requesting that the Congress be furnished with very specific information about the B-1B. In my view, in order to be fully prepared to make prudent and informed decisions about the B-1B the information is needed before the end of the year.

Specifically, the Department of Defense must tell us the following:

First. What the target requirements—both strategic and conventional—the B-1B is able to meet with its current capability and projected to meet in the future.

Second. What is the B-1B's current mission effectiveness.

Third. What are the detailed near- and long-term B-1B spending plans and their justification.

Fourth. What does a cost-benefit analysis of fixes and enhancements of the B-1B show us. That is, what do the additional dollars buy in terms of additional capability to improve penetration, deliver weapons and survive the mission as compared to the use of other assets?

Fifth. What are the impacts/implications of potential arms control agreements on the B-1B's role in the overall force structure.

Without this information, the Congress would be placed in a very difficult position. In my judgment, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to justify any additional funds for the B-1B program.

I have been critical of the B-1B program, and it would be very easy to say no more funds! In fairness to all concerned, however, I think we should withhold judgment until all the facts are in.

But we need the facts. For the past 2 years, the committee has sought to get the facts, determine what has gone wrong with the B-1B program and where things really stand with it.

Since the spring of 1986 when we discovered problems with the B-1B's defensive avionics system, we have been told by the Air Force experts that these were normal development hiccups. Not to worry, everything is under control and any problems would be taken care of.

This same pattern was evident during our hearings in February and March 1987. At that time, the Air Force representative told the committee that "We are making good progress, though, in even resolving those problems [ECM]."

Repeatedly, we were told that there really was no major problem with the B-1B. The Department of the Air Force continued to stress the B-1B's performance in the most glowing terms.

At the end of March 1987, the committee issued its report on the B-1B program. Among its conclusions were the following:

First. Promises about the aircraft's performance and capabilities as of fall 1986 have not yet been met and are not all expected to be

met earlier than 1991. The cost and schedule to achieve full operational capability remains uncertain.

Second. The current limitations, particularly with regard to the electronic countermeasure/defensive avionics system degrade the B-1B's effectiveness as a penetrating bomber.

Third. Information provided to the Congress by the Air Force did not afford a balanced assessment on the status; as a result Air Force credibility has suffered.

From that time, the Department of the Air Force has taken issue with our questions about the capability of the B-1B. Further, the Selected Acquisition Reports (SAR) that the Air Force submits to the Congress on major weapon systems barely mention any problem with the B-1B. The SAR is designed to provide the Congress with factual information on a program's status in terms of cost, schedule and performance.

The latest SAR on the B-1B states that the only problem with the defensive avionics system is the lack of adequate contract reserves. There is no mention of its fundamental inability to perform to specifications.

Contrast this, if you will, with the recent testimony before our Research and Development and Procurement Subcommittees. The Department of Defense Director of Operational Testing and Evaluation, John Krings, had this to say about the B-1B:

We will probably accomplish about 50 to 60 percent in terms of gross assessment of what it was supposed to do. We are talking about survivability, of penetration, kind of lumping all that together—all scenarios, good ones, bad ones, et cetera—about 50 percent * * *

This testimony was provided to the committee following a report from the Department of the Air Force that the recent flight tests of the B-1B's defensive avionics turned up "limitations within the current system architecture."

In response to a question from Representative BILL DICKINSON, the committee's ranking Republican, on what this really meant, Krings replied:

The number of threats that are being dealt with are significantly lower than those originally [planned]. We clearly do not accomplish what we started out to do. This system will not deal with threats that it was identified to deal with. It will deal with some of the them successfully, which it really did not even do until recently. It really was not successful in overcoming hardly any of the threats.

Quite simply, according to Krings, "the architecture, the capability of the B-1 ECM system and the ALQ-161 is incapable of handling all the threats."

As a result, Krings gave the defensive avionics system, the ALQ-161A, a grade of D in its current state. This comes after the expenditure since 1982 of nearly \$3 billion for the system. Regrettably, it was not until July of this year that we found out really how bad things are with the B-1B.

This brings us to a very critical point. The question is where do we go from here. At a minimum, we need answers to the questions raised in the correspondence to Secretary Carlucci. Without those answers, we may well be faced with the prospect of parking the B-1B.

As matters now stand, we are looking at some undetermined cost to fix the B-1B, some \$8 billion in potential enhancements for the aircraft, and a Congressional Budget Office projection of a \$71 billion price tag to develop, produce, operate and support the aircraft over its 20-year life cycle.

In a similar context, if one looks at strategic program spending trends for the period covering the years 1981 to 2004, some interesting issues emerge. Based on unclassified material and assuming START limitations, we could well spend in fiscal year 1989 dollars an estimated \$425 billion for major strategic programs.

Interestingly, the lion's share of the costs, some \$242 billion or 56.9 percent would be allocated for strategic bomber programs, \$105 billion or 24.8 percent for submarine launched ballistic missile programs and \$78 billion or 18.3 percent for land based ballistic missiles programs.

The fact that the major share of the strategic dollars would go to bombers suggests strongly that we need to realize a very significant yield in terms of capability for this type of investment. We need to ask ourselves if this money would not be better spent on systems that do not have as many uncertainties as the B-1B program.

Much is being made of the cost of the Midgetman program, for example, but the real cost in strategic systems is not ICBM's but bombers. Is this the right allocation of our strategic dollars? Do we really want to spend more on bombers (re: fix-up the B-1B) and cut back on a survivable ICBM missile?

I want to assure my colleagues that the committee is establishing a structure and a process for resolving the B-1B's status. Following the August district work period, I will report further on the committee's course of action.

In the meantime, I want to call to the Members' attention the forthcoming release of a report by the Congressional Budget Office on the B-1B program. Last year, at the request of the committee, CBO undertook a study of the B-1B and possible options for the program.

The report reviews the current status of the B-1B program, discusses the various issues associated with the program's status, outlines several options for the B-1B, identifies a number of program enhancements, and analyzes the B-1B's penetration capabilities against Soviet air defenses. I hope that my colleagues will avail themselves of the report. It should help to familiarize the Members with the major issues associated with the B-1B.

ANNA DILLARD—OUTSTANDING SENIOR CITIZEN

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a generous and caring people. Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the particular efforts of Anna Dillard of Waverly, OH.

Because of her willingness to give of her time and energy to the people of her community, Anna Dillard has been nominated by the Pike County Senior Citizens Center for the 1988 Outstanding Senior Citizen Award.

Anna has worked diligently for the Senior Citizens Center and its patrons. She has served as a volunteer for the center for 10 years. Moreover, Anna has always provided the essential organizational support to ensure the success of the center's efforts and local activities. She is a caring individual and is always willing to come to the aid of other people.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Anna's family and all of her many friends are proud of her outstanding achievements. It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my heartfelt best wishes to Anna and her family for this special recognition. It is my sincere hope that she will continue to share her good spirits with the people of Pike County, and we wish her every success in her endeavors.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, according to the most recent analysis, the deficit in the Federal budget for the fiscal year ending September 30 will total \$154 billion.

While that figure is 30.2 percent lower than the record \$220.7 billion deficit in the 1986 budget year, it is almost \$4 billion higher than the deficit for last year. Under current assumptions, next year's deficit is expected to be about the same as this year's figure.

These figures demonstrate that Congress has made significant progress in reducing the overall deficit. Unfortunately, they also show that we have reached a plateau. Without further extraordinary effort and compromise, the annual budget deficit will not fall below the \$140 to \$160 billion range.

The deficit for the current fiscal year is about 3.4 percent of this country's entire gross national product and approximately 14.6 percent of anticipated outlays by the Federal Government. In simple terms, the Federal Government will take in about 85 cents for every dollar spent this year.

The last 7 years have been a disaster in terms of our Nation's fiscal policy. The national debt has more than doubled and net interest payments have tripled to about \$150 billion—about \$2,800 for each family in this country. We have to turn this situation around.

It might help to analyze how we got ourselves into this mess. It seems to me that the deficits we have suffered with over the past 7 years are partly the result of our failure to ask the American people what they were willing to pay for, not just what they wanted from their Government.

It is clear that our constituents have wanted lower taxes. It is equally apparent that they want the Government to provide more services and devote resources to try to solve the problems of homelessness, drug abuse,

access to health care, and other important issues facing our Nation.

Our job is to resolve the conflict. After all, while reasonable people can differ on what our particular spending and tax priorities should be, no one should disagree over the bottom line: Huge deficits in the Federal budget are unacceptable when the economy is relatively strong, as it has been over the last several years.

Unfortunately, the Congress is not well suited to this task. Frankly, it takes strong leadership to unite the disparate forces within the Congress behind a workable program and that leadership ordinarily must come from the President. This President has not helped. In my 6 years in the Congress, he has never sent us a balanced budget or even proposed a plan that would lead to a balanced budget within a reasonable period.

In the absence of Presidential leadership, the Congress has made some progress, but our basic decision has been to defer the issue to the next administration.

That administration will have the difficult burden of persuading the American people that it will be necessary to pay more in taxes while receiving less in terms of government spending. It won't be easy.

However, the alternative—allowing our fiscal policy to continue on its current course—is unacceptable for several reasons:

The money needed to finance the deficit is being borrowed not only from Americans, but in large part from Japanese and European investors. Large sums are also being borrowed from the same sources to finance private domestic consumption. We have made ourselves international debtors and seriously undercut our Nation's ability to chart an independent economic course.

The deficit has significantly affected the ability of the Federal Government to respond to emerging needs.

It is immoral to ask our children to pay for our profligacy.

There is no question that the imbalances will ultimately be remedied. The real issue is whether we have the courage and wisdom to reduce the deficit in an orderly, disciplined way or we will wait for some cataclysmic economic event—like the Great Depression—to lead us to the necessary adjustments.

I am confident that, with effective Presidential leadership, the 101st Congress can go down in history as the Congress that put us on a sure path to a balanced budget.

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA AND OUR ANTI-APARTHEID STRATEGY

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I supported economic sanctions against South Africa in 1986 to promote nonviolent change, racial equality, and democracy in that country. Unfortunately, since the passage of the last sanctions bill, South Africa has made little progress toward dismantling the barriers of apartheid.

The new sanctions bill, H.R. 1580, would move beyond current sanctions, mandating substantial American withdrawal from that country. This legislation would, among other things, prohibit all United States investment in South Africa. This prohibition would extend not only to future investment, but to current holdings as well. It would also prohibit all imports from South Africa (except for strategic minerals and publications) and all exports to South Africa (except for certain humanitarian donations). Supporters of H.R. 1580 believe that international economic isolation of South Africa could threaten an economic collapse and lead to a swift and dramatic end to apartheid. However, recent developments in Panama show some of the difficulties of using massive economic sanctions and withdrawal to achieve certain foreign policy goals, and how those means may result in unintended consequences.

The present array of sanctions, enacted over President Reagan's veto, asserts the United States' implacable hostility toward apartheid and attaches significant penalties to maintaining that system. At the same time, active involvement by United States companies, either circumventing or in outright defiance of obnoxious apartheid restrictions, for example, on housing workers in racially segregated areas, provide an alternative path of protest against apartheid and a chance for black economic advancement. Our vocal reiteration of this position by the words of our diplomats and the actions of our businesses in South Africa strengthens anti-apartheid forces and serves as an instrument for empowering the black majority.

Our antiapartheid policy must contain a comprehensive series of strategies, including vocal denunciation of racial discrimination, sanctions to impose a cost for maintaining this policy, and active American involvement in South Africa to circumvent apartheid and to represent the ideal of racial equality. In my view, H.R. 1580 leans far too heavily toward American withdrawal. I strongly believe that American presence is a force for good in South Africa, and, therefore, I must oppose this legislation to remove American influence from the South African scene.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. FREDRICK CHIEN

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise to commend the fine work of Dr. Fredrick Chien, the Representative of the Republic of China in the United States, as he leaves Washington to return to Taipei. Dr. Chien has been appointed as the Minister of State and Chairman of the Council for Economic Planning and Development. I offer him my congratulations on his recent appointment and my thanks for his fine work on behalf of his country.

One of the major responsibilities Dr. Chien will have as Chairman of the Council will be United States and Taiwan trade relations. I

wish him well in this capacity and hope that his ideas and suggestions will influence the continued improvement of the two-way trade picture that we have seen in this year. Reports indicate that the United States actually replaced Japan as the number one foreign supplier of goods to Taiwan, the first time in 25 years that our exports have achieved that position.

Much more progress is needed, but the trend seems to be running in the right direction and I am confident Dr. Chien will do his best to promote fair and friendly trade dealings between our two countries.

Beyond issues of trade, however, I believe Dr. Chien has demonstrated in his years in Washington that ties between Taiwan and the United States rest on something far deeper than commercial interests. The real strength of our relations stands on the sincere friendship which the American people offer to another people and society who share our dream of freedom. The relationship between the free people on Taiwan and the land of freedom in America is bound by common values of free enterprise, the worth of human life, the rule of law, democracy and world peace for which we each are striving. If there is one thing Dr. Chien achieves in his new undertaking, I hope it will be the continued ability to articulate and administer the proper formula for preserving lasting, friendly ties between Taiwan and the United States.

Dr. Chien has treated all issues relating to United States and Taiwan relations with skill and diplomatic professionalism. His calm and realistic approach has contributed to a course of cooperation between our countries.

I am confident that Dr. Chien will succeed in his new position of responsibility as he has throughout his distinguished career. I send both Dr. and Mrs. Chien my best wishes for their future and the future of United States and Taiwan relations.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago this month, we woke up one morning to the news that Soviet troops had occupied Czechoslovakia, crushing in one fell swoop the first fragile flowering of freedom among that proud, but imprisoned, people.

That brutal action served then as a stark reminder of a basic strategy of the Soviet Union: the subjugation of all freedom-loving peoples in Eastern Europe by whatever means are necessary.

For the many Americans of Czechoslovak descent, the events of August 1968 are especially bitter, but their remembrance is particularly important. As we contemplate the phenomenon of glasnost in Moscow, it serves us well to remember the history of repressive acts perpetrated by Mikhail Gorbachev's predecessors, before we fall into the embrace of the latest Soviet regime.

To help my colleagues recall the reality of August 1968, I commend the following essay, written by Mojmir Povolny, chairman of the executive committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, and a resident of my home town of Appleton, WI. Let his eloquence speak for all those who yearn for freedom in Czechoslovakia.

THE TANKS OF AUGUST
(By Mojmir Povolny)

Twenty years ago in the night between August 20 and 21, more than half a million Soviet and other Warsaw Pact troops invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia to bring to heel the country awakening from twenty years of a totalitarian nightmare. According to the treaty imposed upon the Czechoslovak government in Prague on October 16, 1968, the Soviet troops were to be stationed on the Czechoslovak territory "temporarily". Twenty years later, the Soviet army of occupation still holds the country in its grip, the Czechs and the Slovaks vegetate in the shadow of its might, and the eyes of the world have turned away from the land which was the inspiring and eventually the tragic focus of their attention in 1968.

In spite of the suggestions made in Moscow last November at the time of the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution that a new assessment of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia was needed, the Kremlin has so far remained silent.

The twenty years of Soviet occupation have been one of the most depressing periods in modern Czech and Slovak history. The first objective of the Soviet Union—to insure that Czechoslovakia be governed by Communists absolutely subservient to its authority—was quickly accomplished. The government and the secretariat of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia became mere branches of the Soviet Embassy in Prague.

Under the Soviet command the paramount preoccupation of the Czechoslovak Communist apparatchiks has for twenty years been the "normalization" of life in Czechoslovakia. In political terms "normalization" has meant the restoration of the Party's monopoly of power and the elimination of all factors that could challenge and jeopardize the central purpose. The return to the totalitarian conception of rule marks the present Czechoslovak Communist regime as one of the most oppressive governments in the Soviet bloc.

The settlement of accounts within the Party was followed by the most severe persecution of the young people who refused to live only on their knees and wished to create for themselves a niche in which they could be free in their camaraderie and with their dreams. When in the middle of the 1970's the human rights movement gained momentum in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Czechoslovak President signed the Final Act of Helsinki one day and on the next day began to persecute and arrest his subjects who claimed for their fellow citizens the human rights and fundamental freedoms of that very document. The Charter 77 movement, its offspring the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted (VONS), and human rights advocates outside these structures have been victims of incessant harassment.

If the coup of 1948 nipped in the bud the economic recovery and development of what used to be one of Europe's most advanced industrial countries, the Soviet invasion has

been followed by Czechoslovakia's complete dependence on the Soviet Union, its economic policies, and its foreign policy wherever it is being carried out by economic means. Under this intensified linkage the country has stagnated in the backwaters of centralized planning, inflexible management, and heavy-handed political interference. Today, the Czechoslovak Communist leader Milos Jakes promotes an even greater integration of Czechoslovakia's economy with the economy of the Soviet Union.

No wonder, then, that the morale and the productivity of the Czechoslovak workers are low, that they steal and moonshine more than they economize and labor in their enterprises, that corruption is the accepted rule rather than the repugnant exception, and that the spoilage of the natural environment through ruthless exploitation of its resources has scarred the once beautiful country for years and years to come.

The Soviet invasion struck Czechoslovak culture like a hurricane when it passes over a garden in its early growth and bloom. The devastation has been total. What the invasion had left undone, the Czechoslovak Communist regime tramples out day in and day out with blind determination. The cultural production which is permitted is nothing but production, without intrinsic value, interest or importance for a people who had historically turned to their writers, artists, composers, and to their intelligentsia in general in times of distress and peril for consolation, success, and inspiration. The cemetery of the once flourishing culture is the silent but also the most telling plaintiff against the country's Communist rulers.

The capital victims of the present condition have, however, been the ordinary Czechs and Slovaks. The alien power and the vassal government have made a mockery of all the public virtues that used to inform their democratic past and to which they aspired again in 1968. The complete degradation of their public life has been for a generation gnawing on their private virtues and eroding the quality of their private lives. Inner emigration is the mildest form of the general malaise: dishonesty, envy, divorce, alcoholism are the spreading symptoms of the decline of the civil society in Czechoslovakia.

And yet, despite the weight of the occupation and of the totalitarian rule, the country refuses to surrender. Charter 77 and VONS have become a permanent fixture of the Czechoslovak and international scene. The underground scholars, writers, and artists are developing an independent culture with which the official culture bears no comparison. The young people have the courage to challenge in the streets of Prague the phony peace propaganda of the regime by asking for real peace and freedom. New political initiatives call for the democratization of the system, for the neutralization of their country, and for a new Central Europe. In return to religious faith more and more people rediscover the spiritual dimension of human existence which the Communists have tried in vain to obliterate with their ideology.

All the Czechs and Slovaks live in the hope that one day these evil times will pass and that they will return to the family of free and sovereign nations.

**A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
MR. WILLIAM C. BARNES**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding man in my district, William C. Barnes. Mr. Barnes will be given the Community Service Award by the Community Services Development Corporation on October 12, 1988. I am pleased to have this opportunity to say a few words about him.

William Barnes is a true Californian. He attended Long Beach City College, obtained his bachelor's degree at Pepperdine University, a master's degree from California State University at Los Angeles, and did some graduate work at the University of Southern California. Besides being educated in Southern California, William has also spent his life working in education in southern California. He was employed by the Compton School District for 11 years, and filled the roles of teacher, counselor and basketball coach. He has also worked as a consultant for the California State Department of Education, the Los Angeles and Orange County Unified School Districts, the Compton College District, and the Norwalk-Mirada School District. Since 1966, William has worked for Long Beach City College in various capacities. He started as a counselor, moved to assistant director for special projects, personnel, and in 1969, became a dean at the college. Since 1980, William has been the dean of the Pacific coast campus.

When asked to list his hobbies, William will name "civic improvement" as one of them. However, I know first-hand that William does not treat his community activities as weekend hobbies. Over the years that I have known William, I have watched him throw his body and soul into projects that no one else has the courage to take on. Originally, my wife Lee and I got involved with William through the Congressional Award Council. As the former vice chairman and a current member of the board of governors, William has been a dynamic force with the organization. To William, the Congressional Award Council is not simply another addition to his résumé, but a group in which he acts as an anchor and a catalyst.

William has been the head of many community organizations. For example, he was the vice president of the chamber of commerce in 1982, the board chairman of the Boys Club in 1979, the board chairman of the Red Cross in 1983, the chairman of the Poly Community Interracial Committee, and the president of the Downtown Kiwanis. William has also served and is serving on many boards, including the Boy Scouts, the N.A.A.C.P., the Mayor's Task Force, the Mayor's Task Force on New Directions, the Memorial Hospital, and the N.C.C.J.

The list of William's awards is long and deserved. He was given the Golden Boy and the Golden Man Award from the Long Beach Area Boys' Club, the Black American Award by the Commission on Economic Opportunity, and

the Citizen's Award by the Long Beach Century Club. He is also in the Hall of Fame in Long Beach City College.

I could go on and list more of William's achievements and honors; I have only scratched the surface of his work. William Barnes is a man who has dedicated his life to his community. In every facet of his life, his commitment to others is apparent. My wife Lee joins me in extending our warmest congratulations to William on this auspicious occasion. We wish William, his wife Virgie, and his children Blake, Brian, and Brad all the best in the years to come.

HONORING JUDGE MORRIS TURK

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exemplary citizen of Maryland. Judge Morris Turk retired from the Fifth Judicial Circuit Court of Maryland at the end of July.

Judge Turk has been a public servant for nearly 30 years. He was appointed chief judge of the 5th Circuit in 1975. Prior to that Judge Turk served his State and country in many capacities including as a member of the U.S. Armed Forces.

As a past director and vice-president of the Annapolis Symphony Orchestra and as a member of the Advisory Board of the Annapolis Fine Arts Foundation, Judge Turk has made important contributions to the cultural community as well.

Judge Turk's involvement in our community has been recognized by many. Among his honors are the Governor's Citation for Outstanding Service, Frontiers International Human Relations Award, and the Ambassador for Peace Award from the Jewish National Foundation.

With his wife Irene at his side, Judge Turk has made important contributions to the lives of many Marylanders. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting an honored member of the Maryland Circuit Court and an outstanding citizen, Judge Morris Turk. We all wish him the best for the future.

THE 1988 TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS BILL

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the House passage of the Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988, H.R. 4333, will be welcomed news for many who have sought relief from burdensome tax provisions unforeseen during consideration and passage of the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

The most important provisions of the Miscellaneous Revenue Act are embodied in the technical corrections language. This portion corrected technical drafting errors in the Tax

Reform Act of 1986, and the 1987 tax legislation. Adoption of this legislation was especially important to those in the accounting profession who struggled with the incorrect "letter of the law."

In addition, H.R. 4333 included several tax provisions which were taken from individual bills of which I was proud to cosponsor. For example, among the bill's provisions were:

An extension of the exclusion from income of employer provided education assistance.

An extension of the tax exemption for mortgage revenue bonds.

A 20-percent deduction for certain research and development expenses for businesses.

An extension of the targeted jobs tax credit for businesses which hire the disabled or economically disadvantaged youth.

An exemption for the "phantom income" of mutual funds from the 2-percent floor on itemized deductions.

Permission for artists, writers, photographers and livestock producers to deduct their business expenses from current year income.

A repeal of the collection of the diesel excise tax for "off road" users of diesel fuel.

The legislation also included several provisions which will close certain corporate tax loopholes and thus render the entire package as revenue neutral. Some of these changes include a reduction in the amount of dividend income a company may deduct from the ownership of another company's stock; a repeal of the completed contract method of accounting; and an excelleration of corporate estimated tax payments.

H.R. 4333 additionally contained several tax simplification measures. One of the most important was an explanation of the section 89 requirements dealing with nondiscrimination rules for employee benefits. Under this provision, the Treasury Department will be required to clarify the regulations, which limit an employer's ability to provide highly paid employees better health and life insurance, and various other benefits, than the employer provides to its lower paid employees.

Although I do not believe that H.R. 4333 has put all of these issues to rest, in fact I know several will be revisited, this bill has addressed some of the more pressing tax issues of the past year. Next year the House will again look at several of these tax matters and respond to our constituents needs by further fine tuning the Tax Code.

ANTHONY E. O'BLOCK, BUILDER AND BANKER, COAL MINER AND MAYOR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer one of the most widely known and respected individuals in western Pennsylvania opted to curtail a business/political career that spanned more than half a century in his hometown of Plum Borough.

Anthony E. O'Block, the son of immigrant parents who came to America from the province of Slovenia in Yugoslavia, decided to

step out of the public spotlight into the shadows of private life.

His decision signaled the end of a life's journey which took "Tony" from the depths of the coal mine to the heights of political popularity; from the world of building into the world of banking; from obscurity as a youth to prominence as an adult.

"Tony" O'Block was all of those—and more! As far back as 1925 when he labored in the mines he was determined that one day he would be his own man. That day was not long in coming.

He saved enough from his mine earnings that he soon was able to open his own auto repair shop. Then, in 1935, in the midst of the Great Depression, "Tony" went into the construction business—and began buying stock in the local bank.

In 1941, "Tony" O'Block launched his political career. He ran for the local board, won and served as president of that body for 16 years. He left the board in 1957 to campaign for the office of burgess—mayor—in what was then Plum Township. Again, he won, and when the community was incorporated as Plum Borough, "Tony" O'Block was to be its first—and only—mayor until his decision to step aside this summer.

By then, some 60 years later, "Tony" O'Block, the young coal miner, had carved his own niche in the history of his community: owner of a multimillion-dollar construction business, president of the borough bank, and one of the major leaders of the local and county Democratic Party.

Anthony E. "Tony" O'Block: builder and banker, coal miner, and mayor. Not bad for a man who quit school in the eighth grade!

I wish him well.

MARITA RIVERO HONORED AS BROADCASTER OF THE YEAR

HON. GUS SAVAGE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 of this year, WPFM-FM general manager Marita Rivero was honored by the Black Journalism Review as Broadcaster of the Year at a June-teenth Commemoration in the Nation's Capital at Benjamin Banneker Field.

The Black World Journalism Award was given to the honoree in recognition of her individual contribution, and in commemoration of the 123d anniversary of Juneteenth, the last day of legal slavery in the United States—June 19, 1865.

According to Black Journalism Review editor Askia Muhammad, "Broadcaster Marita Rivero brings a strong commitment to education and high quality alternative radio service to the American noncommercial broadcasting industry, and she is to be commended. In her 7 years as general manager of Pacifica Foundation licensee WPFM-FM in Washington, DC, Ms. Rivero has led the station to unprecedented growth, progress and stability. During her tenure WPFM grew to become the largest minority-managed noncommercial radio station in the country, with an audience size

among the 20 largest of more than 300 non-commercial stations.

"During this period WPFW won numerous prestigious national and local awards for programming excellence, including the George Foster Peabody, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and Ohio State Awards."

Rivero has been appointed to be the new radio manager for the WGBH Educational Foundation in Boston, MA. Her new duties at the Nation's third largest public radio station will include overseeing local broadcast operations; national programming production and distribution; as well as management of the 100,000-watt radio station of more than 40 production, engineering and administrative personnel.

While at WPFW, Rivero is also credited with bringing financial and institutional stability to the young station which was founded in 1977 without an endowment, relying primarily on listener support from the start. In addition she developed the concept of WPFW's news magazine, Audio Evidence, upgraded the station's facilities including building three studios, and was successful in leading WPFW to its current prominence as the Nation's number one minority-managed public radio station. Ms Rivero's personal production credits while at WPFW include: "Royal Weekend: Count Basie Live at the Post Office Pavilion," January 15, 1984, Washington, DC; "20th Anniversary March on Washington," August 23, 1983; "Jazz Fathers & Sons," featuring Wynton Marsalis at the Kennedy Center, 1984; "1st Annual Cap City Jazz Festival," featuring Miles Davis, 1985.

Rivero returns to WGBH after a 12-year hiatus. In addition to having produced WGBH's weekly community affairs TV series "Say Brother" from 1970-76, she also produced several national and local series specials for WGBH-TV. Rivero has also served as consultant to such organizations as the Public Broadcasting Service [PBS], the Communications Task Force for the U.S. Congressional Black Caucus, the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education's Committee on Black Higher Education. She currently chairs the Steering Committee of the National Federation of Community Broadcasters [NFCB]; is a member of the Distribution of Interconnection Committee of National Public Radio [NPR]; and serves on the steering committee of Blacks in Public Radio.

Rivero is the first black woman to head the radio operations for the WGBH Educational Foundation. She attended Pennsylvania's Lincoln University, earned a bachelor of science degree at Massachusetts Tufts University, and pursued advanced studies at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education, and the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School.

Rivero is affiliated with the Capital Press Club, the National Press Club, the Washington Area Broadcaster's Association, and American Women in Radio and Television. She is listed in Who's Who in Black America, and has received the Washington DC, YWCA Black Achievement Award.

This year's Juneteenth observance in Washington, DC, was unanimously recognized by the Council of the District of Columbia in a Ceremonial Resolution which said in part:

Whereas, June 19 has been recognized for decades as "Juneteenth," an unofficial Independence Day for Americans of African descent . . .

The Council of the District recognizes Juneteenth as representative of the highest ideals of this democracy, specifically the dignity associated with freedom, especially freedom of speech, religion or assembly, all of which allow individual Americans to fulfill their highest potential.

Founded by Mr. Muhammad in Chicago in 1976, the Black Journalism Review is a quarterly periodical which focuses on the news, communications, and entertainment media from a positive black perspective.

ADOLESCENT FAMILY LIFE PROGRAM

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I offer legislation to revise and extend title XX of the Public Health Service Act, the adolescent family life demonstration projects. This bill amends the current program to provide a full service program to meet the pressing needs of children who bear children.

The United States is in desperate need of such a program. One in ten young women between the ages of 15 and 19 will become pregnant in 1989. Our Nation leads nearly all other developed nations in rates of teenage pregnancy and childbearing; almost twice the rate of Britain, the next highest country.

The numerous problems incurred through early childbearing have resulted in an appalling rate of infant mortality. Teen mothers are less likely to receive early prenatal care, all too often resulting in the death of their children. It is my hope that providing services to low-income teen mothers can assist in the halt of this national tragedy.

The adolescent family life demonstration project was established almost 10 years ago. We have studied the benefits of different approaches in delivery of services. We have learned much through this program, and we have used that information to craft a full service program that targets those individuals who most desperately need our assistance.

The new full service program would authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants and enter into contracts with public and nonprofit private entities. These organizations would provide services to pregnant adolescents choosing to carry their pregnancies to term. Services would include comprehensive prenatal and postpartum care, well-child care, family planning services and a variety of counseling services.

My bill was crafted in conjunction with an ad hoc coalition of approximately 20 organizations experienced in providing services to pregnant adolescents. We have demonstrated a need for this program. Each year 178,000 teenage girls under the age of 18 give birth. Under the current demonstration project only 9,000 of them are served. The time has come for us to expand this program from a demonstration project to a full service program in an

effort to help as many of these teens as we possibly can.

REAL JOBLESS RATE AND LOW WAGE JOB EXPLOSION LOWERS AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as Members evaluate the monthly employment and unemployment statistics in an attempt to formulate appropriate policy responses, we must look beyond the current official Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] overall figures. The official BLS figures may accurately indicate the extent of employment and joblessness, as defined by current BLS definitions of employment, unemployment and labor force participation, but those definitions are antiquated and inappropriate, and do not adequately represent the real situation in the labor market.

When the people who are working part-time for economic reasons, and the discouraged workers and others who no longer are counted as being in the labor force by BLS because they have given up their job search, are added to the official BLS unemployment rate, a much more precise and realistic view of the labor market is presented.

In the August 1988 analysis done by Council on International and Public Affairs, entitled "Joblessness and the Pauperization of Work in America," authors Ward Morehouse and David Dembo use this more comprehensive statistical method and show the most recent quarterly jobless rate to be at a dismal 12.0 percent in June.

Using BLS statistics, their quarterly analysis also tracks the explosion in low-wage job creation during this decade. Three-quarters of the new jobs created during this administration are in the two lowest-paying sectors of the U.S. economy—retail trade and health and business services. The report compared the job performance records of the Carter and Reagan administrations and found the Reagan record trailing its predecessor on both number of jobs created annually and the quality of those jobs. The report also observes that the number of persons below the poverty line increased 38 percent from 23.4 million in 1974 to 32.3 million in 1986.

Another publication, entitled, "A First Friday Alert," by the National Committee for Full Employment, also bases its monthly unemployment calculations on definitions different from BLS, but very similar to those of the Council on International and Public Affairs. The First Friday Alert released August 5, 1988, showed that 12.9 million Americans were unemployed and underemployed in July. The alert pointed out that average retail wages were only \$6.28 per hour in July, and that retail employees worked an average of 30 hours per week, a full 10.7 hours less than manufacturing workers who were earning \$10.18 per hour.

The alert also pointed out the economic disparities some regions of the country are experiencing. For instance, Michigan, Louisiana,

West Virginia, New Mexico, Kentucky, Mississippi, Alaska, and Puerto Rico all have official unemployment rates over 7 percent, and Illinois' rate was 6.4 percent, and Texas was at 6.3 percent.

These analyses have major policy implications. They document economic weaknesses and that current policies and programs are not meeting the needs of millions of millions of Americans in very difficult and stressful circumstances. We must move ahead with an overall economic policy and targeted education, employment and training agenda which will enable every American able and willing to work to have the opportunity to find employment at fair rates of pay.

RETIREMENT OF EVA J. DENEV

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at the end of August, Eva J. Denev, my longtime legislative director, will be retiring. Eva has been a member of my staff for the past 23 years and I wanted to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for her many years of loyalty and dedication.

Eva came to Washington in 1946 after receiving her master's degree from Northwestern University and began her career in Government at the State Department. She was part of the American Mission for Aid to Greece and spent a year working in Athens during the critical years of postwar recovery.

After working in the area of foreign aid for the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Mutual Security Agency, Eva joined the staff of Senator Thomas Burke and began a long tenure as a congressional staffer. She subsequently worked for Senator Earle Clements, Senators Richard and Maurine Neuberger and Senator Harrison Williams before joining my staff as my first legislative director.

During more than two decades of outstanding service, Eva has been a trusted and invaluable adviser whose breadth of knowledge and expertise were of great assistance to me. Although she was involved in a wide range of legislative issues, Eva is best known to her friends and colleagues for her commitment to the protection of animals. As an ardent animal lover both in her personal and professional life, she has worked diligently—behind the scenes and in her quiet manner—on behalf of this important cause and her efforts have made a difference.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to Eva Denev. I know that her many friends join with me in extending heartfelt best wishes to her for a healthy and happy retirement. We will all miss her.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO THE PASHAMI DANCERS

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to an organization, the Pashami Dancers, which has provided a unique cultural service to Michiganders for the last 20 years.

The Pashami Dancers are a nonprofit dance company, specializing in west African dance and have furnished people across the State of Michigan with the opportunity to view firsthand the vitality and complexity of west African dance, music, and culture. They have been especially successful in distilling this experience to children, including 300 primary and secondary schools in the State, as well as to numerous civic and community service groups.

Additionally, the Pashami Dancers have traveled within the United States to share their performances with others. They have been goodwill ambassadors to several west African countries, including Ghana, Senegal, Togo, Nigeria, Benin, Gambia, and Cote D'Ivoire, where they have perfected their skills in the dance, music, and drumming.

Their service to us has been made possible by several outstanding individuals' contributions to them. Among these individuals is their founder, Dorothy Jones, who still serves as artistic director and who has passed on her knowledge to countless students and teachers of the dance. Doris Bohnam Copedge has been a member of the Pashami Dancers for all its 20 years, exemplifying the dedication and commitment of the company. Members of the troupe have distinguished themselves in fields as various as law, teaching, medicine, nursing, business, and engineering.

The Pashami Dancers have enriched the lives of thousands of people. I ask you to join me in thanking and congratulating them on the occasion of their 20th anniversary, and to wish them continued success in their efforts to promote cultural awareness.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION FOR THE LAKE POWELL LAND EXCHANGE, UT

HON. HOWARD C. NIELSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to improve land ownership patterns and management of State and Federal lands in the State of Utah around the Lake Powell area. I present this bill before this distinguished body for your consideration.

This legislation is to consolidate State of Utah school section lands scattered throughout Capital Reef National Park, Glenn Canyon National Recreation Area, and the Navajo Indian Reservation. The intent is for the State to consolidate these properties along Lake Powell, to enhance local economies, increase public access to Lake Powell, and enhance

August 11, 1988

revenues to the State's school system from State land trust properties. Any development of these blocked State lands would be in harmony with the National Park Service's general management plan for Glenn Canyon National Recreation Area, and are sites that the National Park Service has identified for potential future development.

With this in mind, I ask for the support of all my distinguished colleagues in passing this legislation to improve the economic stability of this rural area in my State, to monetarily improve the Utah's school trust fund, and to block scattered land parcels for better public land management.

GLOBAL WARMING DUE TO THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, the devastating drought now occurring in the U.S. farm belt focuses our attention on the impact that permanent changes in climate could have on peoples lives and on the overall economic activity of the country. Global warming, and associated climate changes, is a predicted outcome of the greenhouse effect. The release into the atmosphere of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide, has been greatly accelerated during this century due to industrialization and energy production associated with it.

The scientific evidence that climate change will result from the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is no longer in substantial dispute. A consensus has formed among scientists that the cause and effect are beyond dispute. There remain uncertainties about the timeframe of global warming. But we know for certain that the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is growing; that greenhouse gases persist in the atmosphere for at least a century; that there are no feasible methods for artificially removing them; and that the ultimate severity of the effect on climate may not appear for decades after initial release of the gases.

We face then, a situation involving a potentially catastrophic outcome, which is irreversible but ultimately can be mitigated by our own actions. It is imperative that we formulate a plan of action.

The concurrent resolution is a clear statement that we cannot afford to ignore the greenhouse effect and is an assertion that positive steps must be taken. The first step must be a comprehensive national energy policy. One bright spot is that there are policies which make economic sense and which will mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, such as improved energy efficiency. Since the oil shock of the 1970's, U.S. energy use has increased little as the economy has grown, largely due to conservation. However, the United States is still about half as energy efficient as other industrialized countries, so that there are still significant gains to be achieved through conservation.

Only by means of coordinated actions at the national level can we avoid unintended consequences. Federal policies to encourage use of a particular fossil fuel or synthetic fuel in order to reduce reliance on imported energy sources, for example, will impact the greenhouse effect, since different fuels release different quantities of carbon dioxide for equivalent energy output. A national policy would balance the tradeoffs between economic and environmental impacts.

The second point of emphasis in the current resolution is that policies to mitigate global climate change must involve international agreements which implement coordinated international strategies. The atmosphere knows no boundaries. Whatever actions we take alone to control the greenhouse effect will ultimately be futile in the absence of international cooperation. The process of negotiating international agreements is difficult and time consuming. But the greenhouse clock is ticking, and we have no time to lose in initiating the process of achieving international accords.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the resolution with its call for action.

LABOR DAY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the significance of the public holiday, Labor Day. Since 1894, Labor Day has been observed annually by both the United States and Canada on the first Monday in September. On May 8, 1892, at a meeting of the New York Central Labor Union, Peter J. McGuire suggested reserving a day to pay tribute to American industry. Mr. McGuire requested that the holiday be on the first Monday in September because it would conveniently fall between the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, thus "filling a wide gap in legal holidays."

Labor Day is renowned for recognizing industrial workers as major contributors to the emergence of the United States as a world power, as well as commemorating the labor movement. The labor union movement originated during the aftermath of the Civil War deriving itself from the Progressive Movement. Workers united under one voice to call attention to the injustices of the labor system. These workers toiled long hours, for low pay, under unsanitary and unhealthy conditions. Mr. McGuire, the son of Irish immigrants, could identify with the extreme poverty that had oppressed his respective laborers, and was determined to make public his outrage.

At the 1894 Labor Day parade in New York City something occurred that would set a trend for subsequent Labor Day celebrations. A group of women garment workers reluctantly marched in the parade, adorned in their usual ragged attire. One of their representatives replied, "So much the better, let them

march in their rags so that the New York public may see how they are treated." Although demands for reform of improvement in the American labor have never ceased, the emphasis on Labor Day as an opportunity for bringing worker's problems to public attention has diminished. Today, Labor Day is regarded as a suitable time to reflect on the history and accomplishments of the labor movement to date, and to inform workers of any developments from the previous year.

A bill to establish Labor Day as a Federal holiday was introduced in Congress in 1893, and it was approved by both Houses within the next year. I know my colleagues will join me in celebration on Labor Day whether in leisure or reminiscent of the roots of our present labor system.

TRIBUTE TO MS. BARBARA REYNOLDS

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor USA Today journalist Barbara Reynolds who has written an uplifting book titled "And Still We Rise." This book celebrates the achievements of 50 black role models in education, entertainment, sports, the arts, and the media. Keeping in mind that the reenactment of the 1963 March on Washington is right around the corner, I encourage my colleagues to read this timely collection of interviews in which Ms. Reynolds taps into the lives of special black Americans who, in many instances, broke the barriers of racism, sexism, and sometimes poverty in order to achieve their goals.

Ms. Reynolds has worked for several newspapers including Chicago Today and the Chicago Tribune, as well as major magazines such as Ebony and Essence. Presently, she is the Inquiry page editor of USA TODAY.

Ms. Reynolds was inspired to write her book because many of her associates at USA TODAY were motivated by the interviews she did daily. She aptly writes that "many of the people in this book are role models not only for black people but for the nation" (xi). Furthermore, Coretta Scott King comments in the epilogue that "[t]his book shows that black Americans have something special to contribute to this country and the world, a strength and tenacity and a gift for compassion that has been finely honed and tempered in our struggle for survival and freedom" (219).

Colleagues, after you read "And Still We Rise," I know that you will feel as uplifted as I am about the many contributions that black Americans have given to our country. Indeed, this spirit of uplift is what we need to make our commemorative March on Washington a remarkable experience.

THREE SAINTS CHURCH MARKS THE MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANITY IN RUSSIA

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, 1,000 years ago during the reign of Prince Vladimir, Russia adopted the Eastern Orthodox influence from Constantinople and embraced Christianity as the state religion. This event marked the canonical emergence of the Russian Orthodox Church, which has remained the characteristic form of Christianity in Russia. In 1589, when Moscow was recognized as a separate Patriarchate, Russian Orthodoxy became a force independent of Constantinople.

Over the centuries the solemnity and holiness of the splendid ritual, the beauty of the music, the richness of the vestments and the color of the icons have given warmth and life to the faith. The Patriarchs, Bishops, and Priests provided leadership and vision and together with the faith and devotion of the adherents, created a church with tremendous spirit and compassion.

It is my hope that the feelings and attitudes brought about by the impact of the processes of glasnost and perestroika will continue to provide an atmosphere conducive to religious understanding and appreciation. In celebration of the millennium of Orthodoxy in Russia, the Moscow Patriarchate sponsored conferences on the history, theology, spiritual tradition, liturgical life and art of the Russian church and anxiously awaits the jubilee edition of the Bible in Russian. Closer to home, the Three Saints Church in Garfield will present a reception honoring the millennium celebration on Sunday, August 14, 1988.

It is with the greatest respect and admiration that I wish His Excellency, Bishop Clement, administrator of the Patriarchal Parishes of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States my warmest best wishes. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to participate in the tributes being extended on this joyous occasion and I know my colleagues in the House will join me.

H.R. 5193, THE DEGRADABLE PLASTICS ACT OF 1988

HON. H. MARTIN LANCASTER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of my colleagues to legislation I introduced yesterday which would take a significant step toward addressing problems caused by plastic waste. The Degradable Plastics Act calls upon EPA to issue rules requiring that, within a total of 7 years, certain plastic items be degradable. The included plastic items add up to the vast majority of all plastic waste.

When the many labor-saving uses of plastics became apparent half a century ago, a

new age of convenience began. There was an understandable tendency to believe that "disposable" somehow meant an item simply disappeared. Only recently has that misconception begun to fade, confronting us with the difficulties against which we must weigh the benefits of plastics and other waste products. Certainly today, life without plastics would be most difficult. For this reason, this is an area in which the Federal Government has a special obligation to take realistic steps to protect the environment.

This issue has a special impact on my district and the State of North Carolina in a number of ways. North Carolina's Third District, like the districts many of you represent, lies on the coast. Plastic waste unquestionably presents a special hazard to marine wildlife. This problem will not be completely solved by the adherence of the United States to annex V of the Marine Pollution Treaty [MARPOL], which prohibits the disposal of plastic from ships. In some coastal areas across the country, analysis of debris has revealed that more than a third of the plastic waste was not from vessels, but was strewn along the coast by beach-goers. A recent study by the Interagency Task Force on Persistent Marine Debris concluded that marine debris affects individuals of many endangered, threatened, and commercially valuable species of marine wildlife. Understandably, it is difficult to establish with certainty figures for marine fatalities due to ingestion of or entanglement in plastic debris each year. It has been estimated, however, that approximately 100,000 marine mammals and 1 million seabirds are killed in plastic debris each year.

In addition, there is the problem posed by our municipal landfills. Once we thought landfills would be the answer to our solid waste problems. This has not proved to be the case. The areas in which we can safely site landfills are dwindling, as a result of public opposition and new realization about the potential hazards to our ground water supply. At the same time, the capacity of our existing sites is being filled at a rate barely dreamed of 20 years ago. In North Carolina, for example, we are approaching a real solid waste crisis. Almost one-third of our municipal landfills will run out of permitted capacity in less than 2 years. Other States face even more immediate dilemmas. In New Jersey less than 15 landfills remain in operation. It is worth noting that the fastest-growing element of the burgeoning solid waste stream is plastic waste, as the production of plastics in the United States has increased from about 6 million pounds in 1960 to nearly 57 million pounds in 1987.

Finally, there is the problem of unsightly and potentially hazardous plastic litter. Millions of dollars are spent by coastal communities each year in beach clean-up efforts in order to avoid losing far greater amounts in tourism revenues.

In order to approach this problem constructively, however, it is important to understand that plastics are not the only culprit in the overcrowding of our landfills and the jeopardizing of our marine environment. Also, I do not view degradability as the exclusive solution to the plastic waste problem. However, it would be regrettable if we allowed ourselves to succumb to paralysis—to fail to act because we

were caught in endless debate over what was the primary environmental culprit. There is no single culprit. There is no single solution. Debate of this issue must extend beyond mere legislative hand-wringing, and towards a realistic discussion of solutions. I believe we should be guided by an understanding that, in addressing this issue along a number of avenues at once—recycling, landfill capacity, cleanup campaigns and increased public awareness, and degradability—we can make meaningful headway in confronting some of our most pressing environmental problems.

One of the truly promising solutions to the problem of plastic waste in an expanded use of plastics which quickly decompose. This technology has been available for a number of years and environmentally benign plastics are already being marketed in Western Europe, Canada, and parts of the United States. Italy has banned nondegradable plastic packaging, effective in 1991. In the United States, 16 States have now banned certain nondegradable plastic products and numerous others are considering such bans.

Producing degradable plastics is a feasible long-term solution to the problems created by plastic waste. This is an area in which the Federal Government has a special obligation to take realistic steps to protect the environment.

Degradable plastics can be manufactured with additives which make them either photodegradable or biodegradable. A number of processes for producing degradable plastics have been developed, most of which include adding degradable agents, such as cornstarch or synthetic substances, directly into the standard plastic production process.

Photodegradable plastics decompose when exposed to the ultraviolet rays of the Sun. Photodegradable plastics have been developed which may break down completely within 2 months on land or about 3 months at sea. Some of the processes which produce these plastics have, as their end product, water, carbon dioxide, nontoxic polymers, or small particles of metals such as nickel, cobalt, copper, and zinc, which are found naturally in the environment. A photodegradable plastic product has now been approved by the FDA for use in indirect contact with food, and an application for direct contact with food is pending. Canada's food and drug watchdog agency has already approved direct contact with food.

Most biodegradables are made by adding substances such as cornstarch to sheet plastic. The average kernel of corn is about 70 percent starch. Crops other than corn can be used to produce biodegradable plastics through fermentation into lactic acid. These include sugarcane, wheat, and barley. Products which have been made from biodegradable polymers include food packaging, shopping bags, garbage bags, polyethylene and polystyrene sheets, blow-molded bottles and vinyl wallpaper. Most biodegradable plastics break down into nontoxic, nonhazardous byproducts and many, such as a plastic bottle manufactured by Imperial Chemical Industries, will degrade in about 1 year when buried in a landfill.

The rate of degradation can be controlled by varying the amount of degradable additive. For instance, tests performed by Agri-Tech In-

dustries of Urbana, IL, demonstrate that samples of polyethylene films containing 50 to 70 percent starch deteriorate significantly after less than a week's exposure to the elements. They became brittle and were finally consumed by microorganisms—the normal process of decomposition accelerated. When the amount of starch was reduced to between 30 and 40 percent, the life of the film was extended to 30 days after disposal.

Production of these plastics would put to good use our country's great capacity to produce agricultural products such as corn. Last year American farmers produced more than 7 billion bushels of corn, necessitating \$12.3 billion in corn price support payments. The exact savings to the Federal Treasury resulting from a Federal commitment to degradable plastics is hard to calculate. However, if 10-percent of all the plastics produced in 1987 had been produced with a 10-percent cornstarch additive, then more than 7.7 million additional bushels of corn could have been consumed. This may have translated into a savings of more than \$240 million in reduced price supports. Some have stated that the use of corn for biodegradable plastics could expand the corn market by 300 million bushels. An increase in corn purchases of this size would, of course, produce an immediate boost in the income of America's corn growers.

Additional agricultural benefits from degradable plastics might include a reduction in the \$100 to \$200 per acre some farmers must spend at the end of each growing season to dispose of the plastic mulch they put down on their fields. Making mulch with degradable plastics could make this cost unnecessary.

There could also be an opportunity for small business and rural economic development as a result of the expansion of this new technology. Some of the most active firms in the expansion of this new technology have been small businesses, such as Agri-Tech Industries. Agri-Tech has employed 11 people for the purpose of perfecting and commercializing the products researched by the Department of Agriculture, and plans to double its employment over the next year.

For all these reasons, and on the foundation of extensive research, I yesterday introduced legislation entitled the Degradable Plastics Act of 1988. Although this bill deals only with degradability, I am eager to have this concept incorporated into the proper recipe of workable solutions to the problem. Degradability should not preclude recycling any more than it precludes public awareness campaigns to halt litter.

The Degradable Plastics Act calls upon EPA to issue rules requiring that, a total of 7 years after the enactment of this legislation, certain plastic items be degradable. The defined plastic items include plastic storage cartons, bags and containers; packing materials; plastic rings on beverage six packs; disposable diapers; and plastic tampon applicators. These items together constitute the vast majority of all plastic waste. Under the provisions of the Degradable Plastics Act, these products must be capable of decomposition at least 2 years after they are discarded.

There are potential limitations with both recycling and degradability. For example, it is

much less cost effective to recycle plastics than to recycle other materials. Recycled aluminum can be sold by municipalities for 61 cents per pound. A typical green plastic bottle, on the other hand, brings less than one tenth of that, about 6 cents. There is the difficulty, especially in rural areas such as my district of North Carolina, in collecting sufficient quantities of homogeneous plastic to make recycling economical. There is also doubt as to whether some types of plastics, such as plastic bags because of the difficulty of collection, and diapers or chemical containers because of their potential toxicity, could ever be efficiently recycled.

Likewise, the drawbacks to degradability of some plastics are also apparent. There are a number of plastic articles that do have a useful life much longer than the few years implied by the degradability option. Although the rate of degradability can be carefully controlled and structural integrity can be maintained during proper storage, there are clearly some plastic items, such as the plastic telephones on our desks, which could not properly be made degradable. Also, no standards have yet been established for defining degradability. My bill would direct EPA to establish these standards, giving them a realistic time frame to serve as a guide.

With the Degradable Plastics Act, I am responding to a broad-based challenge to confront our Nation's solid waste problems. As I stated earlier, the degradability option has been discussed in-depth in State legislatures across the country. Most recently, the governor of Florida signed a law banning nondegradable plastic six-pack ringholders, shopping bags, and polystyrene foam or plastic-coated paper used in connection with food. However, this debate has not yet been carried on by Congress with a national focus. Incremental steps such as the implementation of the MARPOL Treaty; the requirement that plastic six-pack ringholders be degradable; and the discussion of requirements that Federal agencies focus their purchasing practices on degradable plastics are positive steps in addressing some of the aspects of our solid waste problems. What has been lacking, I believe, is a comprehensive Federal proposal that actually encompasses all the aspects included in State debates—actually asking for EPA to establish standards for the degradability of plastic items, within a specific time-frame; actually specifying articles which may reasonably be established as degradable.

In summary, Speaker, degradability is one of the solutions which I believe must be pursued in response to our Nation's problems with solid waste, with litter, with hazards to wildlife. It offers the promise of progress in all these areas. I realize that is an issue which will not be resolved, or even properly discussed, within a few weeks or months. However, I look forward to the debate on degradability and the other potential solutions to our solid waste problems. I urge all my colleagues to study this issue carefully and to support my initiative.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPE COD REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on August 24, 1988, State and local officials from around Cape Cod will gather to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority. It is my pleasure to join with them in paying tribute to the authority and the public transportation services it provides to so many Cape Codders.

The authority was formally established 10 years ago to coordinate the delivery of transportation services on Cape Cod. Over the years it has, with Federal, State, and local resources, developed a public transportation system that has truly enhanced the quality of life for many people who live on and come to visit Cape Cod.

Without the authority's door-to-door "b-bus" service, it would be impossible for many local residents, particularly the elderly and handicapped, to shop, visit the doctor, attend school, or go to work. Without the authority's coordination and support for regularly scheduled bus service between Hyannis, Woods Hole, and Chatham, the cape's roads would be even more congested than they are presently.

It has been obvious to Cape Codders for a long time now that the Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority has significantly improved public transportation in Barnstable County. It is a pleasure for me to salute the authority—and the local officials who serve on its advisory board—for many years of hard and productive work.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE ACID RAIN ABATEMENT ACT OF 1988

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Acid Rain Abatement Act of 1988.

I first introduced the Acid Rain Abatement Act of 1988 on March 31 of this year. The original bill, H.R. 4331, was circulated widely, and I have received comments on that bill from environmentalists, utilities, coal companies, mine workers, and various other industrial and interest groups with a stake in acid rain legislation.

The bill I am introducing today is a refinement of H.R. 4331 based on the comments and input I received. Most of the changes are minor in substance. However, there are two changes of note.

First, I have included in the new bill a specific provision to address the problem of nitrogen oxide emissions from utility powerplants. My legislation now calls upon the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study of the net effects on air qual-

ity of reducing NO_x emissions by 1 to 3 million tons from 1985 levels. Unless, based on the study, the Administrator finds that no net air quality benefits may be obtained from such a reduction, he shall require the installation of cost-effective NO_x controls at all the plants covered under my bill.

The second important change in my new bill involves Federal assistance for clean coal technology. Rather than providing for a maximum 20-percent Federal contribution to any given clean coal technology project, my new bill would provide up to 50 percent. The Federal contribution shall be determined by the Administrator of the EPA and by the Secretary of Energy. I have been persuaded that, in certain cases, where an emerging technology carries high risks and potentially high benefits to society, a 50-percent Federal cost-share may make the risk worth taking for a utility company.

Having worked over the past several months on this bill with a diverse range of interest groups, I am convinced now more than ever that my bill is on the right track. It is indeed a balanced approach to acid rain control. As legislation, my bill may not be anybody's first choice, but it could be the best choice for the broadest range of interests.

As environmental policy, my bill is responsible. It would require a 10-million-ton-per-year reduction in sulfur dioxide emissions by the year 2003. That is a significant reduction within an environmentally meaningful time-frame.

As energy policy, my bill is progressive. It emphasizes conservation and emerging technologies that are highly efficient as the preferred means of achieving SO_x emission reductions.

As coal policy, by bill is fair. I represent a coal-producing district, and am painfully aware of the hard times that have fallen upon our coal miners. It's important not to do more harm with acid rain legislation. Eastern coal is not only vital to the economy of the East; given a fair chance, it will play a long-term role in our Nation's energy profile. But acid rain illustrates that we need to learn how to burn Eastern coal much more cleanly and efficiently. My bill recognizes that need, and provides the time and money for the learning process to occur.

As national economic policy, my bill adheres to the principle that polluters should find the best way to clean up and they should pay the costs themselves. There is no better way to guarantee cost-effective pollution control than to give polluters a specific goal and the freedom to choose the best way to get there.

Finally, from the residential and industrial ratepayer's perspective, as well as from the utility perspective, my bill is a good deal. No other acid rain legislation currently pending in Congress is as committed to cost-effectiveness, conservation, and progressive technologies. The key is time—my bill would provide more time than the others for cost-effective technologies to mature. If we fail to enact acid rain legislation this year, the sense of urgency to deal with the issue will only increase, and future legislation is unlikely to be as reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act on acid rain is now. We must make a commitment, and get started with a program as soon as possible. I believe my bill is fair and responsible. I urge my colleagues to give it all due consideration.

FAMILY LEAVE WOULD HURT WOMEN

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, the mandatory family leave bill, H.R. 925, which has been scheduled for floor action on September 14, would increase discrimination against women in the workplace, according to a study completed by the Cato Institute, a public policy research organization, in June.

The study, completed by Deborah Walker, an economist at Loyola University in New Orleans, concluded:

Because leave benefits are an added cost, employers would avoid hiring candidates who appeared most likely to use them . . . and if more women entered the labor market because of the legislation, wage rates in female-dominated occupations would go down.

The study also found:

First. Similar laws in European countries have "effectively decreased the competitiveness of women in the labor market."

Second. Married women of child-bearing age would be driven from the labor market or would fail to climb the corporate ladder. These women's employment opportunities would actually decrease.

Third. A recent survey of 700 firms found that 77 percent already have formal or informal parental-leave policies. A compulsory program would be economically ruinous for many small firms, driving them out of business and thus curtailing economic growth and job creation.

Fourth. Family-leave legislation would increase the number of women in the work force. "The greater supply of females in the marketplace would tend to drive down wage rates."

Fifth. The women most affected would be those with general skills and little experience or education.

Sixth. Industries employing more women, particularly retail and service industries, would see higher prices "because the cost of implementing the benefit would be higher." The resulting decrease would prompt employers to lay off workers, the majority of whom would be women.

Seventh. The legislation would hinder mutually advantageous exchange by forcing companies to decrease output, go out of business, or increase consumer prices, and the economy's efficiency would decrease.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN TRIBUTE TO THE CENTRAL VALLEY WORLDRUNNERS

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, this marks the second consecutive year that a contingent of runners from the Central Valley of California will travel to the Soviet Union to participate in the 1988 Moscow International Peace Marathon. These 14 Central Valley runners, as members of the international WorldRunners organization, will carry with them to Moscow the message that hunger and death by starvation can be eliminated by the year 2000.

WorldRunners is a nonprofit international running organization with membership from 47 countries around the globe. Like most running clubs, WorldRunners is engaged in athletic competition, sportsmanship and teamwork. Unlike most running clubs, however, WorldRunners is committed to ending hunger and death by starvation in our lifetime.

The Central California contingent of WorldRunners includes: Ted and Lisa Ruffner, Larry Andrews, Ken Dildine, Jennifer Epp, Larry Harris, Nina Hawawini, Jeff and Martha Kirishian, Everett and Connie Richardson, Sharon Smith, Chuck Thrapp, and Jennifer Whitney. These WorldRunners will run for donations which support hunger relief agencies around the world, including the African Food and Peace Foundation, Bread for the World, Catholic Relief Services, UNICEF, Save the Children, World Vision, the Hunger Project, WorldRunners International Foundation, and many others.

Today, an estimated 40,000 individuals worldwide will die from the effects of hunger; this year alone over 15 million lives will be lost due to malnutrition related illness and death. As equally staggering as these statistics are is the problem that this grim reality can be eliminated by the year 2000. The Moscow International Peace Marathon and accompanying 10 kilometer run, in which these and 13,000 other WorldRunners will convey their message, will occur on Saturday, August 13, 1988. The Central Valley runners will act as ambassadors of the United States, carrying the American flag which has been flown over our Nation's Capital, to promote the goal of ending hunger not only in lesser developed countries of the world but throughout urban and rural America as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is known that we currently have the technology and resources to end world hunger. Now all we need is the commitment and political will to do so. I commend the Central California WorldRunners for their continued stand to end world hunger and wish them the best as they journey to Moscow for the second time in their efforts to eliminate hunger and starvation.

August 11, 1988

ISLAND PARK ENERGY TAX CREDIT EXTENSION

HON. RICHARD H. STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which will grant a 2-year extension of an energy tax credit for the proposed Island Park hydroelectric project located in my congressional district.

Extension of the tax credit until December 31, 1990, is necessary to ensure that the project can move forward and be completed in a timely manner. In particular, the continued availability of the tax credits will assure that planned site-specific environmental protection measures can be economically implemented.

I am very pleased that my distinguished colleagues from Wyoming [Mr. CHENEY], Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], and Utah [Mr. OWENS] are cosponsors of this important bill.

This project, which will produce enough clean hydroelectric energy to supply some 3,000 homes and small businesses, is proposed to be built at an existing dam. It will result in long-term economic benefits to the electric consumers served by the Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative in eastern Idaho. In addition, part of the power produced will serve portions of Montana and Wyoming.

In my opinion, this project represents the type of energy development our Nation should be pursuing to combat increased air pollution and the so-called Greenhouse effect. The 2-year tax credit extension I am proposing is justified on both equitable and revenue raising grounds.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Island Park project merits a special extension because it was the subject of recent project-specific congressional legislation which has unfortunately affected its ability to be "in-service" by the end of 1988, when the energy tax credit expires.

The basic reason for the requested tax credit extension is to offset adverse, but unintended financial impacts which the passage of the Electric Consumers Protection Act of 1968 [ECPA] has had on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] licensing process.

In October 1986, Congress passed ECPA, which, by name, authorized the Island Park project. However, the legislation also set forth special environmental standards for the project to meet, over and above the traditional FERC licensing requirements.

These special environmental protection measures will help ensure that construction and operation of the project will be done in a manner that affords complete environmental monitoring and protection.

Although the project proponents moved quickly to address the special ECPA provisions, and established a special multiinterest advisory committee to promote discussion and agreement among all interested parties, the bottom line is that the requirements of ECPA, which apply to this project only, have resulted in a very lengthy FERC licensing process—far in excess of what was anticipated before Congress stepped in.

Unfortunately, ECPA, which was intended to help the project, has resulted in an unforeseen licensing delay which threatens the availability of the energy credits so critical to the project.

All my bill seeks to do is to extend the tax credits for this one project in order to enable it to be financed and completed as intended. Stated in another way, my bill will undo an unintended impact of the legislative process on this particular project.

I should also note that the extension of the tax credit for this project will result in a modest short-term, and substantial long-term gain to the U.S. Treasury. The project, if built, will produce significant payroll, royalty, and income tax payments to the United States—not to mention the State of Idaho.

If the project is not built, however, these tax revenues which exceed the tax credit amount, will not be forthcoming. Thus, my bill will result in a net gain to the Treasury.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, enactment of this bill will ensure that a very worthwhile hydroelectric project can move forward. It enjoys broad, bipartisan support and is in the public interest. I am hopeful that the bill can become law before Congress adjourns for the year.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GEN. LEE V. GREER

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Maj. Gen. Lee V. Greer upon the occasion of his retirement. For the past 3 years, I have had the privilege to work closely with General Greer as commander of McClellan Air Force Base in the Fourth Congressional District of California. General Greer has had a long and distinguished career with the Air Force. I am extremely proud that such an individual served at McClellan AFB. I know that his family and this Nation can take great pride in General Greer's service to his country. I would now like to take this opportunity to review General Greer's accomplishments and career for the benefit of my colleagues.

After he completed his studies at Georgia Institute of Technology in 1957, General Greer was commissioned through the Reserve Officer Training Corps Program and entered active duty in September 1957. For the next few years, General Greer was stationed at various Air Force bases in the South. He received flying training at Spence Air Base, GA, and Greenville Air Force Base, MI. Next he attended all-weather interceptor training in F-86L's at Moody Air Force Base, GA, while serving as an instructor pilot until August 1960, when he was assigned to Perrin Air Force Base, TX. General Greer served as an instructor pilot in F-86's and F-102's at Perrin AFB. In 1963, he completed Squadron Officer School.

In June 1964, General Greer began A-1E training at Hurlburt Field, FL, and was subsequently assigned to Bien Hoa Air Base, Republic of Vietnam. During his tour in Vietnam, he flew 215 combat missions in A-1's while

serving with the 1st Air Commando Squadron and the 602d Air Commando Squadron.

Upon returning from the Republic of Vietnam, General Greer entered Texas A&M University and earned a master of science degree in computer science in January 1967. Following graduation, he was assigned to the 328th Fighter Wing at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, MO, as a supply officer. In August 1968, the general transferred to Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, where he served as chief of the Operations Analysis, Test and Evaluation Directorate. During this period he flew F-102's in support of operational tests with the 4750th Test Squadron.

General Greer was then assigned to the 22d North American Air Defense Command Region, Canadian Forces Base North Bay, ON, Canada, in August 1970. He served as chief of the Live Exercise Branch, Exercise and Evaluation Directorate.

Following completion of the accelerated Maintenance Officer Course at Chanute Air Force Base, IL, General Greer commanded the 405th Field Maintenance Squadron at Clark Air Base, Philippines, from June 1973 to September 1974. Earlier, General Greer completed Air Command and Staff College in 1973 and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces a year later. Upon completion of his tour at Clark Air Base, he returned to Tyndall Air Force Base as commander of the 4756th Avionics Maintenance Squadron. He served there until August 1976, when he became commander of the 318th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron, McChord Air Force Base, WA.

In August 1978, General Greer transferred to Hill Air Force Base, UT, and served as inspector general for the Ogden Air Logistics Center until March 1979, when he became chief of the Resources Management Division within the Directorate of Maintenance. From September 1980 to May 1982, the general was director of maintenance for the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center at Robins Air Force Base, GA. After his tour at Warner Robins, the Fourth Congressional District was honored when General Greer was named vice commander of the Sacramento Air Logistics Center at McClellan Air Force Base. In June 1983, General Greer became vice commander of the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center, Tinker Air Force Base, OK. In April 1984 General Greer was assigned as deputy chief of staff for logistics management systems, Headquarters Air Force Logistics Command, and commander, Logistics Management Systems Center, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. General Greer assumed the commander's position at McClellan AFB in 1985.

The general is a command pilot with 5,000 flying hours. His military decorations and awards include the Legion of Merit with one oak leaf cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross, Meritorious Service Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Air Medal with seven oak leaf clusters, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Combat Readiness Medal, and Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Silver Star.

For the past 3 years, General Greer has served McClellan AFB and the Sacramento community with great dedication and ability. I know that my Sacramento District Office Staff as well as myself, will greatly miss the general. I know my colleagues join me in extend-

ing our best wishes to Gen. Lee V. Greer upon this retirement and to his wife, Rosemary, and his children Susan, Gregory, Douglas, and Virginia.

THE NEED FOR PEACE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, August 2, an incident occurred in Nicaragua that demonstrates why the House must continue to refuse to authorize military aid for the Contras. Rev. Lucius Walker of New York the executive director of the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization [IFCO] was injured in an attack on a civilian ferry traveling the Escondido River to Rama, 150 miles east of Managua.

Reverend Walker and nine members of IFCO were participating in a study tour and had just been visiting the community of Bluefields, on Nicaragua's Atlantic coast. Bluefields can only be reached by ferryboat. It is home to Creole Blacks and to Miskito Indians, and IFCO is interested in monitoring their treatment by the government.

Reverend Walker and his group boarded the ferry, called Mission of Peace, to return to RAMA from Bluefields, a 5-hour trip. They joined 170 Nicaraguan civilians and 25 Nicaraguan soldiers, some assigned to guard the ship and others on their way to other assignments. Three hours into the trip the boat was attacked by machine guns and mortars, fired mainly at the middle passenger deck and the bottom of the boat. The soldiers on the upper deck shot back, and 5 minutes later the attack was over. Two Nicaraguans were dead, and 27 people were wounded. Reverend Walker was the only U.S. citizen injured.

I have expressed my concern to the State Department over this incident. Reverend Walker was traveling on a civilian ship during a cease-fire agreed to by the Sandinistas and the Contras that went into effect April 1, 1988. Although I was very concerned about the safety of the U.S. citizens, Reverend Walker made me realize something else and that is that Nicaraguan civilians continue to be wounded and killed in Contra attacks.

We have a choice. We can support the Arias peace plan, which was signed just about 1 year ago. Despite some setbacks, President Arias continues to work with his neighbors to bring about peace. Without his initiative and drive, it is doubtful that the Sapoa Accords would have been signed. Progress has been made in Central America, but we can decide to hinder that progress by approving more Contra aid. If our true interest is peace for our neighbors, we will stop funding warfare and concentrate our effort on regionally supported solutions, such as the Arias peace plan.

AMERICAN HERITAGE TRUST

HON. BERYL ANTHONY, JR.

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD that I am a cosponsor of the American Heritage Trust Act, and fully support the benefits this piece of legislation will provide for the cities and counties in my State. Anytime a program is creative enough to become self-financing, it contributes to our economic health. The basic thrust of this bill is to reinvest the revenue which is generated by our offshore oil and gas leases into permanent, interest-generating accounts. While the principal would never be spent, the yearly interest would be used to purchase open space and provide recreational facilities across-the-board. By investing reasonable but substantial sums now and for a few years into the future, we can guarantee a continuing investment in the viability of these programs which address quality of life issues.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund program, supported by the Act, has enabled over 619 projects in 75 counties since 1966 to be completed, totaling over \$38 million. However, because of the success and non-controversial nature of this program, it has escaped the high visibility and limelight which often fosters support. Therefore, I would like to bring to your attention the importance this program has had for Arkansas.

Columbia County, AR, contains 26,444 citizens, and is typical of most Arkansas counties in that it contains one principal small city, Magnolia, and several smaller towns, with much of the remainder of the county rural in nature. Due to this rural nature, few communities have the resources or the population base to develop recreational opportunities of the scope of these being developed at Lake Columbia.

In August of 1983, Columbia County, realizing the need for a water supply and a lake for recreational purposes, called for an election on a county-wide sales tax of 1 percent to create the Columbia County Rural Development Authority and construct a 3,000 acre lake. The voters of the county approved the tax, and bonds were issued for construction.

As part of the planning process for the lake, the engineers developed plans for recreational developments, including boat ramps, picnic areas, trails, and the necessary support facilities such as roads, parking areas, restrooms, and utilities.

In fiscal year 1987, Columbia County submitted a Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF] application for development of these recreational facilities at the newly completed lake, and subsequently was awarded \$28,750.00 in Federal LWCF funds. The total cost of recreational development is expected to exceed \$155,000. Obviously, if more LWCF money had been available, much more could be done to effectively realize the potential of the lake. The development of this project is important not only for the local citizens for which it will provide a water supply and recreation, but will have an impact on the region

and State in increased tourism and recreation-related expenditures.

Without the LWCF, this dream could not have been realized. Therefore, I strongly urge the support of the American Heritage Act which will establish a self-perpetuating trust to sustain such programs.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE ALBERTO C. LAMORENA, III

HON. BEN BLAZ

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. BLAZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the new presiding judge of the Superior Court of Guam, the Honorable Alberto C. Lamorena, III.

We are particularly proud of Judge Lamorena. He was born and raised on Guam, and after graduating from John F. Kennedy High School, he went on to earn his bachelor's degree at the University of Illinois in Urbana, IL and his law degree at Drake University in Des Moines, IA.

In 1979, at the age of 29, Judge Lamorena followed the footsteps of his late father, Senator Alberto T. Lamorena, and was elected into the Guam legislature where he served as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the 15th and 16th Guam legislatures, and more recently, as minority leader in the 19th Guam legislature.

As a legislator, Judge Lamorena was known for his fairness and his ability and willingness to listen to all sides of an issue. Never one to call attention to himself, Judge Lamorena worked seriously and effectively in passing important legislation which provide for equality of representation in all government boards and agencies; assistance to farmers, retirees, students and families; and protection to disabled persons from job discrimination. His loss at the legislature will be more than made up with his presence on the territory's highest court.

Judge Lamorena is a member of the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the Guam Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, the American Civil Liberties Union, and from 1983-85 served as chairman of the board of Guam Legal Services Corporation. He is also deeply involved in community organizations having served as legal advisor to groups such as the Filipino Community of Guam, the Ilocano Association of Guam, the Guam Visayas Mindanao Family Association, the Society of Filipino American Teachers, the NCS Community Association of Guam, and the Filipino Presidents of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't often that a member of this body rises to call attention to a constituent of his. It is a genuine pleasure for me to do so today for I know Judge Lamorena personally and have witnessed firsthand the enormous respect and popularity that he enjoys. Judge Lamorena is a member of the group of local sons and daughters who have been trained professionally and are returning home to provide our territory the leadership we need as we look forward to our new political status as a commonwealth in closer association with the United States.

I am honored to be the one to memorialize this memorable event by this entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HONORING THE BREA-OLINDA HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1968

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1988, members of the Brea-Olinda High School Class of 1968 will gather together in Brea, CA, to reflect on the changes that have occurred to their alma mater and hometown during the past 20 years.

Early in this century, the oil towns of Brea and Olinda, CA, joined together to establish a high school for the benefit of both areas. And it was just two decades ago that the graduating class of 1968 saw the multi-storied Brea-Olinda High School building renovated into a modern air-conditioned facility. It was a dramatic change, but one that most students accepted as a part of the Brea and Olinda communities.

Over the years, Brea's population has mushroomed, while Olinda has remained a sleepy village nestled in Carbon Canyon. Yet, these two communities eventually unified under a single city government due to their longstanding concern for a quality educational facility.

The class of 1968 will return to find another dramatic change in their alma mater. The original school is being replaced by a new one at a new location. The new campus will be accepted by students and alumni as they recognize the progress and prosperity that has been enjoyed abundantly over the last two decades. Most importantly, the championship athletic records, the scholastic achievements and the traditions of Brea-Olinda High School will continue to exist and to inspire current and future students to appreciate the legacy of their hometown school.

The class of 1968 can be proud of their contributions to Brea-Olinda High School. The gathering of members of the 1968 class for a 20-year reunion demonstrates the interest and concern for Brea-Olinda High School as an educational facility and community focal point. I am confident that the progress of the next 20 years can equal that of the past two decades.

Congratulations to the Brea-Olinda High School Class of 1968.

A BAN ON EXPORTS OF HAZARDOUS WASTE

HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent washup of medical waste on east coast beaches has focused attention on our increasingly alarming waste disposal problem. Clearly, there are right ways and wrong ways to

deal with dangerous waste. Some of the right ways are recycling, reduction, and sound management systems that ensure safe and proper disposal of waste in an environmentally sound manner, and at the source of its generation. One painfully obvious wrong way is the dumping of such waste in our oceans or sewers—and another, which has received less attention but is equally dangerous and careless, is the shipment of trash to debt-ridden Third World countries.

Today I am introducing legislation that urges the U.S. delegation to the upcoming U.N. Environment Program working group session on waste exports to support a global ban on hazardous waste exports. Faced with soaring disposal costs and a lack of dump sites, some businesses have been looking to the Third World as a dumping ground for their toxic trash. Faced with a need for quick and easy hard currency, some developing nations are eager to trade dollars for waste. This equation spells enormous danger to the environment of these nations and the health and safety of their citizens.

The most recent atrocity of this nature took place in west Africa, where 15,000 tons of toxic ash from a municipal incinerator in Philadelphia was dumped on the beaches of Guinea. The United States is not the only perpetrator, nor are all of the shipments upfront and honest: last month, the Nigerian Government discovered that toxic and radioactive wastes from Italy had been secretly dumped at one of its ports. In addition, a recent report released by Greenpeace International details 115 proposed or actual shipments of wastes from Europe and North America to developing regions. The shipment of waste to cash-starved nations is an easy way to make it someone else's problem, and businesses from industrialized nations are more than eager to pass the buck.

The environmental and health dangers of these waste exports are obvious. Developing nations simply do not have the knowledge and facilities to deal with toxic trash. As a result, barrels of cancerous waste and mounds of lethal ash are left on beaches where children play, and where contaminants are free to seep into precious drinking water.

In addition to these obvious dangers, these actions provide a new irritant in the tense relationship between the industrialized and developing world. Waste dumping has been referred to as "toxic terrorism" by Third World leaders who see it as another example of insulting exploitation. How are we to ask these leaders to cut their emissions of CFC's, or limit their burning of fossil fuels, or put a halt to deforestation, when we use their shores as garbage dumps?

Mr. Speaker, the only solution is a global ban on all hazardous waste exports, except in instances where responsible bilateral agreements already exist between the exporting and importing country. In this country, waste exports are guided by the principle of "prior informed consent," but this regulatory mechanism has clearly failed. Consent must be based on truth, and this has not been the case when toxic substances are misrepresented as road fill or fertilizer, and when exporters can locate corrupt officials to sign off on any shipment for a quick and easy payment.

Unless we're willing to fund inspectors at every port, this mechanism cannot work, and it should not be included as the basis of an international agreement on hazardous waste exports.

I applaud my colleague, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, for introducing legislation to ban all U.S. exports of toxic waste to countries with whom we do not have an existing bilateral agreement. I also applaud the U.N. Environment Program, and the delegates from 40 nations and 15 international organizations, for meeting to draft a convention to regulate the toxic waste trade. We must now call on these delegates, and the U.S. representatives in particular, to carry the Conyers example one step further, and institute a global ban on hazardous waste exports. The shipment of hazardous wastes should not be regulated, because it should not be happening. Any convention should be based on this premise, and should point out the need to eliminate hazardous waste at the source of its generation, or to dispose of it as close as possible to that source. I urge my colleagues to join me in sending an important message to our representatives at the UNEP Conference that the export of hazardous waste is simply unacceptable, and that toxic terrorism must end.

PHYSICIAN DUE PROCESS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, an administrative law judge in Dallas suspended sanctions against Dr. Teddy Darocha of Canadian, TX, that were prohibiting him from treating his Medicare patients and filing for reimbursement under the Medicare Program. The sanctions were imposed by HHS Inspector General Richard Kusserow, after the doctor had been cited by the Texas Medical Foundation, the peer review organization that oversees the medical profession by contract for the inspector general.

One year ago, that doctor could not have had recourse in the actions taken against him. Because Congress passed into law H.R. 1445, the elderly patients of this rural doctor will not be denied the care they want and need.

Last fall, we passed H.R. 1445, as an amendment to the budget reconciliation act, to amend section 1156 of the Social Security Act to ensure physicians' hearing and judicial review rights before exclusion from the Medicare Program. Under this bill, the Office of the Inspector General is prohibited from enforcing sanctions against a physician without a hearing unless the OIG can show the doctor's continued practice poses a hazard to the public.

In other words, physicians are given the right to due process, and can present evidence for their case before an administrative court judge. In the past, many physicians were often tried and hung, so to speak, without being allowed to submit their side of the case to an impartial judge.

The case of the Canadian doctor is a test case for this law—and should serve as a

precedent for other doctors who may be marked for sanctions under the PRO system.

I am proud that we were able to pass this much needed legislation—and that this doctor, along with other physicians and the elderly residents they serve—have benefited and will continue to be helped by this bill.

This is one of the first judicial victories and should indicate to the inspector general, Richard Kusserow, that he can't sit over there in his ivory castle and make all types of bluster and bragging and misleading speeches; that while he can talk down to men and women who come before him and have heretofore been at his mercy—that there are many Members of Congress who are neither interested in nor impressed by his pomposity.

Even physicians have a right to due process—and in the short 120 days you have left—Mr. Kusserow—I suggest you try to get acquainted with this fact, and never again try to deny any American due process!

RELIEVE SMALL BUSINESSES OF A NEEDLESS BURDEN

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, the solutions devised by Congress for our country's problems often impose burdens on our citizens and institutions. Whether or not they achieve their purpose is another matter, but most of the time, the burdens that are imposed have a purpose.

For example, the 1986 Immigration and Control Act requires every American employer to verify the citizenship or immigration status of each employee. The purpose of this provision is to make it harder for illegal aliens to find jobs in this country, and thus to discourage illegal immigration.

To comply with the 1986 law, employers must maintain an I-9 Employment Verification Form for each employee.

Although I believe it should be permissive in nature, the I-9 provision does have a purpose.

However, there is another provision of the 1986 Immigration Act that is pointless and redundant. This is the requirement that personnel consulting firms maintain I-9 forms not only for their own employees, but also for anyone they recruit or refer who is successfully hired by a client firm.

This is a duplicative effort, because the client firms must also maintain I-9 forms for the people they hire. Therefore, the 5 to 10 percent of workers who are hired through personnel consulting firms are the only workers for whom two sets of I-9 forms must be kept. One I-9 form per employee should be enough.

To correct this situation, I have introduced H.R. 4581, a bill to eliminate the requirement that those who "recruit or refer for a fee" maintain employment verification forms for those they recruit or refer.

The placement industry mostly consists of small businesses, for whom the duplicative I-9 requirement is a substantial burden. H.R. 4581

would relieve placement firms of an inequitable and time-wasting paperwork requirement.

That is what my bill would do. And that is all it would do. It would not absolve any employer anywhere—including placement firms—of the requirement to verify the employability of everyone they hire.

By reducing the scope of applicability, H.R. 4581 would also reduce the regulatory burden on the INS.

This is good legislation and I hope my colleagues will strongly support it. Congress does our Government and our constituents no service when it imposes duplicative paperwork requirements on thousands of small businesses, especially when those paperwork requirements serve no useful purpose.

Who benefits from requiring personnel consultants to go through the I-9 exercise? What compelling national interest is served?

The vast majority of personnel agencies are small businesses, often sole proprietorships, frequently one- or two-person establishments, where competition is fierce and resources are spread thin. They provide a critically important service in the employment marketplace. They link people with jobs. I call on my colleagues to join me in relieving this industry of a needless burden.

COLLATERAL REVIEW OF CRIMINAL JUDGMENTS REFORM ACT OF 1988

HON. BILL GRANT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, In 1987, Americans proudly celebrated the bicentennial, or 200th birthday of our Constitution, the document which gives form to our diverse and sometimes divergent peoples. I concur with the perceptive patriot who characterized our Constitution as one of the greatest creations devised by the minds of men. The Constitution guarantees us freedoms never known in the history of civilization and protects the way of life we hold so dear by limiting the role of the Federal Government and by guaranteeing certain protections for our citizens. Like freedom of speech and religion, protection against arbitrary imprisonment is one of the fundamental rights Americans enjoy.

As a way to protect that right, the framers of the Constitution incorporated a provision from English common law, habeas corpus. The existence of habeas corpus gives a defendant a method to challenge the grounds of executive detention. The framers considered habeas corpus so essential for preventing potential abuses of authority by the Government that they provided only two instances when it could be suspended, during rebellions and invasions.

I share the view held by many judges and attorneys that 200 years later, habeas corpus has evolved into much more than the framers ever envisioned or intended. They argue correctly that the seemingly endless series of appeals now common in capital cases is firmly rooted in the expansion of habeas corpus applications by judicial activists mainly in the fif-

ties and sixties. The dividing line between our much admired system of State and Federal courts, at least as far as capital cases are concerned, has become blurred beyond distinction as defendants are regularly granted habeas corpus petitions to retry issues in Federal court which have previously been decided fairly and accurately by State courts.

Additionally, the ability of a Federal district judge to hold veto power over State appellate courts has resulted in friction between the two systems, while the explosion of habeas corpus petitions has transformed the Federal courts into capital appeals processing stations, squeezing out the proper consideration of virtually all other types of cases.

No less than U.S. Supreme Court Justices William Rehnquist, Warren Burger, and Lewis Powell have decried the misuse of habeas corpus petitions since the U.S. Supreme Court in 1976 established the constitutionality of the death penalty.

Justice Powell had this to say about the system in 1983. "As capital cases accumulate, they add a new dimension to the problem of repetitive litigation * * * many of these persons were convicted five and six years ago. Their cases of repetitive review move sluggishly through our dual system. We have found no effective way to assure careful and fair and yet expeditious and final review * * * Perhaps counsel should not be criticized for taking every advantage of a system that irrationally permits the now familiar abuse of process. The primary fault lies with our permissive system, that both Congress and the courts tolerate * * * (There is) need for legislation that would inhibit unlimited (habeas corpus) filings."

Chief Justice Rehnquist, in remarks delivered at the National Congress of Chief Justices just this year in January, referred to the death penalty appeals process as "disjointed and chaotic." "I do not have any particular remedy in mind, but I would welcome receiving suggestions on the subject," he said.

In Florida alone, there are 296 men and women awaiting the death sentence. Yet in the 12 years since the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark ruling which allowed States to reinstitute the death penalty, only 18 death sentences have been carried out.

As a Congressman and as a Florida resident, I support the death penalty. There are certain crimes so horrible, so unimaginable as to, in my judgment, demand it. I also believe that when administered with a degree of predictability, the death penalty has a deterrent effect.

America is a collection of individuals bound by the thin thread of respect for a law. Just as the Constitution must never be compromised for the sake of retribution or revenge, neither can we paralyze justice for long. Cynicism and contempt for government as a whole will be its twin offspring. We cannot afford that consequence as a nation, regardless where each of us stands on the death penalty.

Today I am introducing the Collateral Review of Criminal Judgments Reform Act of 1988. This legislation would establish a 3-year time limit for criminal defendants to apply for writs of habeas corpus in Federal court. While there have been many efforts to enact such a time restriction, I believe my legislation will

protect the constitutional rights of the defendant and allow the sentence arrived at during the course of a fair and impartial trial to be carried out in an orderly and predictable manner.

In February, I and other members of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice and Agriculture, conducted a hearing on the death penalty issue in Madison, FL. We listened to expert testimony from Federal district judge, J. Kendall Sharp, the U.S. Justice Department, the Florida Governor's office and the Florida attorney general's office. The consensus of these witnesses was that without some form of time constraints, the capital appeals process would soon become hopelessly paralyzed.

There is precedence for placing a time limit on appeals.

According to Judge Sharp: "Under Florida Federal Rule 3.850, a convicted individual sentenced to death has two years from final judgment and sentence to file the habeas corpus petition, unless the claim upon which the appeal is predicated was unknown to the petitioner or his counsel or could not have been ascertained by due diligence. Several States also have time limitations on statute of limitations and none of them have been significantly challenged for Constitutional infirmity."

While I support setting a time limit for filing habeas appeals, I also believe we should refine our system of collateral review. To ensure defendants have proper opportunity to seek redress in Federal court, my bill imposes the 3-year time constraint only in cases where defendants have had access to private counsel or an approved State-funded legal assistance program.

A distinguished professor from the Florida State University College of Law reminded our committee that the right to counsel through Federal appeals courts is not guaranteed under our Constitution. In my opinion, this is wrong. I have tailored my legislation to establish the time limitation only in cases where the States provide defendants with legal representation through the Federal appeals process.

Under the provisions of this legislation, no person would be required to go through the habeas writ or capital appeals process without benefit of legal counsel. So, if a State wishes to limit the time for habeas corpus appeals, it must see that appeals counsel has been made available.

While there may be differences of opinion on the appropriateness of capital punishment, the simple fact is that in most States it is the law. And the law is most effective when it is enforced in both an equitable and expeditious manner.

**SUPER ACHIEVER MICHAEL
HOGUE OF ROCK HILL, SC**

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, every so often, a young person comes along who is a super achiever and seems destined for a bright

future. I would like to call Congress' attention to such a young man: Michael Hogue of Rock Hill, SC. Michael has just graduated from the University of South Carolina with a degree in chemical engineering and a 3.8 grade point ratio. He was chosen for Phi Beta Kappa, and elected by his peers at Carolina to be president of their student body. Omicron Delta Kappa has just capped the honors he received during his college years by naming him their "Leader of the Year." ODK chose well. In addition to being president of student government at the University of South Carolina, Michael Hogue has served as student trustee on the board of trustees and as an intern of the office of the president. He has been chairman of the Joint Engineering Council and active in the Chemical Engineering Honor Society. He is headed for law school this fall year and, in my opinion, for great accomplishment thereafter.

AMERICANS GOT A WINNER WITH SECRETARY SHULTZ

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, when President Reagan leaves office in January, one of his greatest legacies is a world that enjoys widespread peace and stability. Much credit for this accomplishment must go to our remarkable Secretary of State George Shultz. Secretary Shultz has worked tirelessly and effectively for global peace. The Omaha World Herald recognized his achievements in an editorial yesterday, and I take this opportunity to share it with my colleagues.

AMERICANS GOT A WINNER WITH SHULTZ IN CABINET

Americans have a winner in Secretary of State George Shultz, who responded to an assassination attempt in Bolivia with his characteristic optimism and courage. His calm, firm statement of his intention to continue his tour was consistent with what Americans have come to expect of Shultz, who is one of the most accomplished of President Reagan's Cabinet appointees.

Since the Civil War, 37 men have held the highly visible and important job of secretary of state. The average tenure of Shultz's predecessors during that period was 3.2 years. Shultz has served six years, longer than all but two secretaries of state since the turn of the century.

Shultz is close to being the ideal example of the public servant in modern America. A graduate of Princeton, he earned a Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and had a brilliant academic career before moving to the highest levels of corporate management. He gave up a lucrative business position to fill the Cabinet spot vacated by Alexander Haig in 1982.

During his time of service as secretary of state, Shultz has been a tireless campaigner and negotiator for peace. He has visited and revisited the Middle East with plans for a permanent peace there between Arabs and Israelis. Frustrated by bitterness and distrust on both sides, he has nevertheless persisted—even in these final months of the Reagan presidency—to find the right formula for that troubled part of the world.

Shultz's finest legacy, no doubt, will be the dramatic improvement in Soviet-American relations and the signing of the first nuclear disarmament treaty in history. Shultz also worked hard for peace accords in southern Africa, Cambodia and between Iran and Iraq.

Recent progress in those areas is due in part to the tireless efforts of George Shultz to bring belligerents together and to use the good offices of the United States and the United Nations to help the peace process. He has understood the uses of power and shares traditional American ideals of political freedom, free trade, negotiated settlements and the rule of law. He has been a splendid public servant.

With less than five months left in the Reagan administration, Shultz shows no signs of diminished energy or enthusiasm.

COL. WILLIAM R. BARRETT RETIRES

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1988, William R. Barrett, colonel, U.S. Army, will retire after 29 years of continuous service to his country.

Colonel Barrett was born in Chattanooga, TN, where he lived until completing grade school. He then moved with his parents to Greensboro, AL. He attended college at the University of North Alabama at Florence, where he graduated with a bachelor of science degree. He received his masters degree at Shippensburg State University in Pennsylvania in conjunction with his attendance at the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, PA.

There is no more important service to our country than defending our Nation. Colonel Barrett has dedicated his life to the service of his country. He has commanded units from platoon to brigade level, in the Continental United States and on freedom's frontier in overseas areas including two tours in Vietnam. He has also served in high-level staff positions around the world. Colonel Barrett's numerous awards include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Army Commendation Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters.

I commend you Colonel Barrett for your distinguished career, and I want to wish you and your wife Mary Alice the very best in your retirement years. Thank you for your invaluable service to our great Nation.

CARL HOLMAN, SHAPER OF THE DREAM

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened yesterday by the news of the death of a great American, M. Carl Holman. Carl

Holman was one of the preeminent civil rights leaders in the history of our Nation. He was a gifted scholar and a dedicated humanitarian who devoted his life to helping his fellow black Americans enjoy a brighter future. Carl Holman's basic philosophy and outlook on life earned him the love and respect of an entire generation of black Americans in a difficult era of social change and turmoil. A leader of leaders, he was a special inspiration to me throughout my own career as a civil rights advocate. M. Carl Holman will be greatly missed, but we will cherish his memory forever.

I would like to share with my colleagues the following articles about M. Carl Holman which appeared in today's Washington Post.

APPRECIATION: CARL HOLMAN, SHAPER OF THE DREAM

(By Jacqueline Trescott)

About 25 years ago Moses Carl Holman was in a civil rights meeting in Mississippi when Marian Wright Edelman came rushing into the room and asked the group to drive with her immediately to the nearby town of Grenada where some demonstrators were being tear-gassed.

"So, I am rushing along with her. Once we got outside, I realized nobody else had budged," said Holman, his voice crackling with disbelief years later. "So we are driving through this darkness. And I was born in the Delta. I didn't realize how dark it is, the sky right down on top of you."

When they got to Grenada, Holman and Edelman found Hosea Williams, the politician and activist, standing on top of a car, shouting to the demonstrators and the television cameras. "He said, 'Here is our lawyer,' and he pulled Marian up and she talked about how important voter registration was. And then [Williams said], 'Here is the only man in Washington who is worth a damn who is on our side: Carl Holman, come up here.' I said, 'Is this man crazy?' He pulled me up and any minute I was expecting a bullet, a rock, something."

The story was prompted by a question about bravery, a question put not just because of the tag of "fearless editor" Holman was saddled with years ago (and which he thought was a misplaced joke), but because of the personal kind of courage he exhibited in fighting the cancer that took his life Tuesday night. Finally, Holman's career was also marked by a bravery of cause, the bravery of a man who had the foresight to seize an issue like rebuilding the cities' neighborhoods and the fortitude to stay with it even as some of his strongest allies fell by the roadside.

Holman, 69, stepped down in May after nearly two decades as president of the National Urban Coalition. Since then, he spoke with The Washington Post on three different occasions about how Washington had changed in his 25 years here, the people he had groomed as activists, others he had opposed. Because of his illness, the first two interviews were interrupted. He spoke from an easy chair in his Southwest town house, with his legs raised on an ottoman. Occasionally he relieved the pain in his legs by standing up with the aid of a cane. The third conversation turned out to be his last interview.

The discussion turned to presidents—Richard Nixon in particular, and his attitude toward civil rights. "He didn't have any gut feeling for this," Holman said first. Then, characteristically, he went on: "On the other hand, that administration was in-

terested in trying to see what could be done about black businesses . . . Democrats tend to think of blacks as workers, with or without jobs, and people needing that sort of help. They tend not to see them as people who would own their own businesses, who would hire people. . . . There is no real future in assuming that the poor you have with you always, and that a disproportionate number of them will be black and we have to help them."

Even so, he saw in one Democrat—Lyndon Johnson—a symbol of the sense of possibility. "In a funny way it wasn't that he was just best for blacks, because it has always been true that I've never seen a president do anything for blacks that hasn't wound up helping whites more. I think he combined—and he was late getting there—a vision, domestically at least, of what this country could be with the kind of political sagacity that a number of the others did not bring."

Holman worked well in the battlefield of civil rights egos, earning the nickname of "the black godfather," and positioning himself variously as talent scout and field marshal. He always said he didn't understand why people wanted to be politicians. But he himself postponed his own desires to write poetry and a novel, putting them aside for other pressing needs.

"He is fundamentally a poet and secondly a teacher and that sort of makes him a dreamer," said attorney Vernon Jordan, who knew Holman for 25 years. "He is also an activist, but too few people see him as a poet." As a graduate student at Yale and the University of Chicago, Holman had won three writing awards.

When Holman first made news of his own, he was a college professor and newspaper editor in Atlanta where he trained a number of students, from politician and commentator Julian Bond to foundation executive James Gibson to television correspondent Charlayne Hunter-Gault. When he moved to Washington in 1962 to work at the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, he became an important liaison among liberal advocates, such as John Gardner, the first president of the Coalition; Dorothy Height, the president of the National Council of Negro Women; and Hyman Bookbinder, former president of the American Jewish Conference.

He knew coalition-building meant bringing in new voices as well as solidifying the old. "Some people of his stature protect their own intellectual boundaries, are fixed in their opinions. He reaches out for new opinions and does not apply a litmus test—unlike a lot of traditional leadership. He looks for the best ideas," said Robert Woodson, the conservative president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise.

When a meeting was needed, Holman could bring people together. When a fight was needed, Holman could quietly orchestrate. When a question needed to be fashioned, Holman was ready. When a statement was appropriate, Holman could find the right words. "He is one of the few people who is able to do in our society a terribly important thing—to bring groups together who may not be in total agreement to start with but who can be helped to see the value and correctness of another side and working together to a common goal," said Bookbinder.

"There have been several periods when I have had the slogan 'Don't make a move without calling Carl,'" said D.C. Del. Walter Fauntroy.

Asked to define his role briefly, Holman was stymied. He looked at the ceiling, his

face, always a glossy etching of lined concentration, now drawn because of illness. "I remember being asked by the national Conference of Mayors [during a debate over the creation of the Department of Education], 'Does this mean that you are in charge of this?' and I said, 'No, it doesn't mean that at all. It just means I thought we might get a few people together and take a look at where everyone stands on this and why.'"

This willingness to have all sides debate, sometimes in his living room, was one of his most admired traits. "There is no doubt that once the commotion in the cities quieted down, it took extra leadership to maintain interest. He kept it going for 15 years beyond that," said John Gardner.

There were also battles in which Holman's brand of temperance was the key ingredient. When Louis Nunez was appointed deputy staff director at the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, some blacks voiced a proprietary view of those jobs. Holman thought, recalled Nunez, that "it was important that the black leadership in the civil rights movement recognize that other minorities could play a major role. That was a revolutionary position."

As he looked back some of the skirmishes were still maddening to him. "When Eleanor Norton was a possible candidate for the EEOC, I had my guns faced in the wrong direction," said Holman. This was 1977, when the argument raged about what was seen as a displacement of men by women who could fill two statistical slots. "Comes to my desk this thing signed by a whole lot of people. I thought at first it was a joke but it was saying, in effect, blacks had so few jobs now, black males, and I was being asked to sign on with what would have been a Stop Eleanor Norton Movement. At first I thought it was funny, then I got angry."

But as he talked, leaping back and forth over the years, it was the story of his role as a bodyguard that brought the longest laugh. During the integration of the University of Georgia by Hunter-Gault and Hamilton Holmes, the black students were constantly getting death threats. When Hunter-Gault and Holmes were suspended after a riot at the dorm, they came back to Atlanta.

"The trip home was through some heavy cracker territory and there were all kinds of rumors the Klan was going to ride," Hunter-Gault explained. "Carl stayed in the front bedroom, the most vulnerable part of the house, and my mother walked into the room with a German Luger my father had given her, and said, 'You might want to have this.' And Carl said, 'It would be just my luck to wing a policeman.' She put the gun away. But the important point was Carl had a family on the other side of town and he made this incredible courageous move."

After he stopped laughing, Holman shrugged off his reputation for defending the battlements. "I was always getting drawn into these situations where people were saying 'the heroic editor.'" He conceded he was willing, but not all that eager to play the role. And he pointed out that he had been exposed to enough violence in St. Louis, where he grew up, and where survival was often "by quite a different code from Gandhi."

At times, things got so tense in the early 1960s that any noise could set off the editor and his staff. Julian Bond was one of the reporters for the Atlanta Inquirer and was sent to the Holmans' kitchen to boil some eggs. "Well, the eggs exploded. At the time, a synagogue and a school had been bombed

by the Klan. So we immediately thought the crusading editor had been targeted. We didn't hit the floor but we jumped. Carl was calm," remembered Bond.

Though he had several stints at the government bureaucracy—from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to White House staff for the preparation of the landmark 1966 conference on civil rights—Holman didn't think that was the right arena for him. Perhaps it was too much exposure to the realities of White House life during those meetings. He remembered one when Johnson walked in before the group was ready for him. "There was some slip-up and everybody hadn't gathered. The reporters were there. And Lyndon comes striding in, his smile ready, and then he sees this handful of people. He left. And when they were going back down the corridor, I heard some of the most flavorsome language aimed at those folks," said Holman.

Since he had already rejected long-term government service, he found it amazing that some friends tossed his name around as a presidential candidate in the early 1970s.

"You know I have never really understood why people go into politics," he said. To illustrate his position, he recalled a meeting years ago in New York when a group of friends were trying to persuade John Gardner to run for president. "When my turn came to speak, there were only six or seven of us. I said 'John, when are you happiest and most at peace with yourself?' The others looked at me and said, 'What the hell is he talking about?' John said, 'Well, Carl, it is when I am sitting out in my garden in Kensington and I have some freshly sharpened pencils and a yellow pad and I have the time to think.' I said, 'You know, I thought that I can't imagine you standing at a factory gate or kissing babies.'"

And it is hard to imagine a gathering now without Carl Holman rocketing through, his tall, wiry frame bent to the wind, or a Congressional Black Caucus weekend without Holman's wrap-up brunch where the politicians gossip and analyze.

When he talked recently, the frustrations sometimes surfaced, but more often his tone was one of understanding. "I have noted how shallow sometimes our foundations are and how precarious our victories. All you needed was to have the Reagan administration come along to find out you could engage all your talent, your time, your energy, on rear-guard action. The country is not fully committed. A new generation of blacks comes along and they aren't as committed," said Holman.

Commitment was Carl Holman's profession. One poem, written when he was a student in Lincoln University in Jefferson City, Mo., 40 years ago illustrates his calling. In "And to the Leaders," Holman wrote:

You must have vision:
Know like a blueprint the way you have come,
And know the present like a familiar sum.
Climb through the smoke to the eastern hill
And watch the dawn rise beautiful and still.
Fire on your tongue, fire in your heart,
Hold the helm in the dirty weather;
When war and prejudice have done their part
Lead us all out together.

M. CARL HOLMAN DIES AT 69; PRESIDENT OF URBAN COALITION

(By Bart Barnes)

M. Carl Holman, 69, a poet, editor, scholar and civil rights leader who had been presi-

dent of the National Urban Coalition for the last 17 years, died of cancer Aug. 9 at Howard University Hospital.

A former college English professor, Mr. Holman was an articulate and forceful spokesman for the urban poor and underprivileged, and he was passionate in his argument about the need to improve educational opportunities for black children.

He was sometimes described as a godfather of the civil rights movement, and he was trusted and consulted by a range of organizations and individuals, from the most radical to the most conservative. He had an uncanny ability to form a coalition out of the most diverse elements, and it was often said that the key to his ability to do this was the fact that he never appeared to have an agenda for himself.

For years, Mr. Holman had traveled extensively about the nation, exhorting black audiences to pay more attention to what he said was the real danger that a large percentage of the next generation of urban blacks would become economically expendable because of a lack of education.

It was not his style to preach or to shake accusatory fingers, but those who heard him could sense his passion and the almost palpable fear in his voice.

"As black America approaches the 21st century, our capacity or our failure to build a solid bridge . . . of works will determine whether millions of young blacks already with us or yet unborn will cross over into the new century, or fall into the abyss," Mr. Holman said this year.

Before moving to Washington in 1962, Mr. Holman taught English at Clark College in Atlanta for 14 years, and while there he was active in the earliest agitations of the civil rights movement. His students participated in lunch counter sit-ins and freedom rides.

Mr. Holman was editor of the Atlanta Inquirer, a weekly newspaper that reported civil rights activities throughout the South. In 1962 the paper won a public affairs reporting award from the American Political Science Association.

A native of Minter City, Miss., Mr. Holman grew up in St. Louis and graduated magna cum laude from Lincoln University. He had a master's degree from the University of Chicago and a master of fine arts degree from Yale, which he attended on a creative writing fellowship. Mr. Holman had published several volumes of poetry and had written extensively in magazines and newspapers on a variety of black and urban issues.

He had taught at Hampton Institute and at Lincoln University before joining the faculty at Clark College.

In 1962 Mr. Holman became an information officer at the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. He became special assistant to the staff director in 1965, and deputy director a year later.

In 1967 the Urban Coalition, an outgrowth of the big city riots of the 1960s, was formed as an advocacy organization for a variety of urban interests with the support of private foundations and corporations. John Gardner, the former secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, was the coalition's first president. Mr. Holman became president in 1971.

Over the ensuing years, Mr. Holman became a major fixture on the urban political landscape, calling attention to a range of city problems that extended from inadequate housing to a declining tax base.

In tone, his pronouncements bore a resemblance to certain preachings of the Old Tes-

tament prophets: Gentrification and urban renewal were creating a new class of poor "urban nomads"; there was a growing and dangerous chasm between the black middle class and the black underclass; illiteracy in America would blunt the nation's competitive edge in the world economy; high school and college remedial programs were too late because most of the students who need them had already dropped out.

In 1982, on the 15th anniversary of the Urban Coalition's founding, Mr. Holman declared that the nation's cities were "in a desperate situation. . . . There is no doubt in my mind that the cities are in much worse shape now than they were in 1967, with unemployment rampant . . . and with most cities having reached the limit to how much they can raise through local taxes."

In recent years he had promoted what he called a "dual literacy" program for black children, emphasizing not only reading, writing and speaking skills, but also skills in science, math and technology, to be learned beginning at an early age.

Locally, Mr. Holman had served on the D.C. Board of Higher Education, which governed what then was Federal City College. He had also been a housing consultant to Mayor Marion Barry.

Survivors include his wife, Mariella, of Washington; two sons, Kwasi Holman and Kwame Holman, both of Washington; a daughter, Kinshasha Conwill of New York City; a sister, Millette Jenkins of St. Louis, and four grandchildren.

"BRAKE THE CYCLE" FOR CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud the work of Dr. Catherine Foote to "Brake the Cycle" of child sexual abuse. Through her campaign, she has brought to the attention of Americans across the country the need for increased resources to prevent and treat child sexual abuse. Through her campaign, thousands of Americans petitioned for greater attention and additional resources to combat the tremendous and growing problems.

Over the last few months, Dr. Foote and her colleagues bicycled more than 3,000 miles across the country from California to the east coast to draw attention to the terrible problems of child sexual abuse. Dr. Foote started out from the headquarters of Parents' United, the exemplary self-help program addressing child sexual abuse that was founded by Drs. Hank and Anna Giarretto in San Jose, CA. After 2 months of her cross-country educational campaign, she arrived in Washington late last week.

Dr. Foote and her companions traveled through state after state, talking with young people who had been sexually abused, adults abused as children, their families, those who had perpetrated abuse, and the range of professionals and advocates who work with them.

Over the last several years, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families has underscored time and again the problems

highlighted by "Brake the Cycle." A national survey by the committee showed a 55-percent increase in child sexual abuse rising the fastest among the three major child maltreatment categories. A recent study by the Department of Health and Human Services indicated that reports of sexual abuse, while not the highest in number, continue to rise the fastest.

Although Congress has just recently reauthorized the Federal law on child abuse prevention and treatment, funding for critical programs particularly addressing sexual abuse, has failed to approach the need. Appropriations for 1989 propose only a very slight increase in the already modest funding for child abuse prevention and treatment.

We need to do much better. All those victimized by abuse deserve no less. Dr. Foote, the "Brake the Cycle" campaign, and the many thousands who signed the petition have provided us with a powerful reminder, encouragement and support.

I commend Dr. Foote, and the children and adults who helped to gather signatures on the petition, for their commitment and for their continuing efforts on behalf of children and families.

TRIBUTE TO MOSES CARL HOLMAN

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of August 9, 1988, the District of Columbia, black America, and indeed the Nation, lost a shining embodiment of human decency, dedication to principle, and loyalty to a cause.

We suffered that loss with the passing of Carl Holman.

Carl Holman was president of the National Urban Coalition for two decades.

During those years, he not only had a keen awareness of the unfolding of a more just and a brighter America, indeed, he was instrumental in bringing that new America about.

From his role in the civil rights movement to his time in the White House; from his reputation at the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to his involvement in the struggle against apartheid, Carl Holman was an unfailing adherent to fairness and principle.

Carl was not one to promote himself, Mr. Speaker; and so he often downplayed the degree of courage and bravery that underlay the choices he made during his 69-year life.

But there are countless prominent black men and women who today function at the highest levels of economic and political life in America, thanks to the efforts and determination of Carl Holman.

Equally importantly, there is an even greater number who today can take certain basic rights and dignities for granted thanks to all that Carl Holman worked for.

Carl made the path easier for us all to be full participants in the promise of America.

For that we are indebted.

For that we are grateful.

THE SEDUCTIVE POWER OF ABORTION

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you a poignant article on abortion. Ms. Olivia Gans, writing for the Respect Life Program sponsored by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops presents a cogent analysis of a very emotional subject. Mr. Speaker, I enjoy you and my colleagues to read this excellent article and ponder this American tragedy.

THE SEDUCTIVE POWER OF ABORTION (By Olivia Gans)

Something about abortion makes it seem to many the perfect solution to the immediate crisis of an unexpected pregnancy.

The lure of abortion stems from our society's desire to avoid responsibility, collectively and individually, for our actions and attitudes. Its seductive power is its promise to eliminate a "problem" neatly and simply, as if that problem—the child—never existed.

As a culture we seek total freedom—freedom from financial worry, discomfort, the demands of others, pain, and obligations. Individuals are expected to be self-sufficient, autonomous, and emotionally contained. We stand in awe of those who seemingly handle it all and make it look easy. But in fact most of us are needy creatures, and many of us are afraid of our own shadow, searching for someone or something to help us fill the void.

As young adults today many of us are sent off to college or take jobs far from home as we set out to build our own lives. Family and faith begin to look outdated as new "freedoms" open before us. Often these acts of breaking away create a sense of isolation that haunts us for a lifetime.

SOCIAL ALIENATION

Abortion is the culmination of this social alienation. In succumbing to the pressure to use abortion to solve her problems, a woman must become totally removed from the thought of herself as a woman, mother and life bearer. She cannot allow herself to bond with her child at all. She is not supposed to connect with the truth that from this moment on she is someone's mother. In reality the question she must answer is: Will I be the mother of a living child or a dead child? Those of us who have faced this fact too late can attest to its power to alter one's life forever.

Abortion is appealing because it allows so many to remain removed from any responsibility to this new member of the human family. Some parents unable to face their own fears or failures, look to this solution when a daughter becomes pregnant. Others who are sincerely concerned for the unborn baby may sadly reject their grandchild because of the sacrifice attached to his or her birth. It seems better to subject a daughter to a few minutes of surgery than to a lifetime of too soon motherhood. But such logic ignores the fact that the daughter is already the mother of a yet unseen child.

Another source of alienation can be found in the role, or lack thereof, that men play in the abortion decision. Ours is an age when personal fulfillment is sought through sexual experimentation, and when young men are not encouraged or challenged to

accept responsibilities they didn't plan for. Abortion is for many men the way out of a sticky situation.

For some it is also a weapon to hold over a woman's head. "Have an abortion or I'll stop loving you," is the spoken or unspoken message that many women hear when they tell their mates about the result of their loving. It all seems so clear and easy. The baby is a threat to the man's freedom, so the baby must go. For some women, their partner's silence or ambivalence leaves them vulnerable to other pressures to abort their child. And since men do not have to participate in the actual bloody, painful procedure they can avoid any immediate confrontation with the violence their ambivalence caused. The abortion mentality has no place for the man who wants to act responsibly towards the mother and their son or daughter. This has been reinforced by recent court cases in which fathers sought to prevent a wife's or a girlfriend's abortion. The law so far has closed them out.

PUBLIC PERCEPTION

The greatest feat of abortion on demand has been to make American society content—if uneasily so—with accepting death as a way to solve problems. All across the United States there are basically good people who feel that abortion is not good, but that nothing else can be done when a mother is poor or a baby is severely handicapped, or the result of rape or incest. Good people are uncomfortable with abortion. This is borne out by public opinion polls which show that American opposition to abortion remains as strong as it was in 1973.

For over 15 years abortion has been portrayed as a simple outpatient surgical procedure with few complications. Mounting evidence, however, is disproving this. Scientific studies of post-abortion syndrome are demonstrating the dangers of abortion to the emotional health of women, as well as the men involved and the siblings and other relations of the lost infant. But the silence and secrecy that surround the pregnancy and abortion very often also attend the private and painful aftermath.

Society feels a need to look the other way when faced with something it has decided to encourage despite its ugliness. So it is with abortion. We dress it up, make it clean, legal and easily available.

We see advertisements for abortion chambers with attractive pictures and words that help sanitize the pain and violence at the other end of that phone number. We use words that imply freedom and maturity when discussing abortion—words like "choice" and "autonomous decision." And we speak of "constitutional rights."

THE VIOLENCE OF ABORTION

The ugliness of abortion is physically evident in films such as "The Silent Scream," "A Matter of Choice" and "Eclipse of Reason." There is little doubt about the physical brutality of abortion for babies and their mothers. But what of the violence of that act upon our hearts and minds?

Women who do not believe they must pit their strength against one who is weaker in order to achieve their fullest potential are silenced in national, state and local women's organizations. The illusion of freedom based on rejecting one's biological makeup is the cornerstone of the major feminist organizations today. Rather than protect our unique ability to bear life, we behave as if we will never reach full maturity and sexual equality until we alienate ourselves from our own bodies.

Some feminist leaders talk of abortion as a mature and life-affirming act. Yet nowhere else do we applaud violence by the strong against the weak to ensure the success of the stronger person. Today the notion of motherhood as bondage and failure is beginning to rise many critics even from within feminist circles. However, this controversy cannot be resolved as long as abortion remains a cornerstone of the feminist agenda.

THE AFTERMATH

It is curious that women who have bought into the notion that abortion will solve their problems are never really at ease with their decision. Most of us feel ambivalence, numbness, anxiety, fear and tension as the hour for the procedure approaches. The dominant feeling days or weeks later is either relief or more ambivalence. There is relief because the crisis appears to have passed. However, research indicates that feelings of regret, anger, despair, pain or loss associated with the abortion may surface five to ten years later.

The factors that can make a pregnancy look like a crisis are always valid concerns. To the individual faced with a problem pregnancy the lure of abortion lies in the subtle promise to resolve those issues. But in her heart each mother knows the world will not be a better, brighter place tomorrow because she accepts this solution. Killing over 15 million children since 1973 has not ended poverty, cured disease or handicaps, or strengthened the bond between men and women or between parent and child.

Pro-abortion people often express pseudo-grief for the loss of the "potential life" of the unborn child and praise the bravery of the mother's "sacrifice." A woman in an abortion counselor's office is led to believe she is wise and brave to end her child's life. If she expresses thoughts that indicate she might want to protect her child, they are generally belittled or made light of. Often the attitude and statements of abortion providers turn the tide at the last minute against the child.

When dealing with a woman experiencing an unexpected pregnancy, most people try to be compassionate, where men are concerned even chivalrous. Men in particular fear being seen as non-supportive or insensitive. No one wants a woman to be in a situation so stressful or unmanageable that she cannot bear her life. This feeling is especially strong in cases of rape or poverty, or where the child might be born with a severe handicap. The most serious problems, however, are not the conditions of the child's birth, but our own fears and attitude about those conditions. By not dealing with our own fear, anger and misperceptions, we add to the pressure on the woman to abort.

CHANGING ATTITUDES

Are we a society fit only for perfect people? Mothers are more likely to reject and abort their children because of social pressure today than in any previous generation. By not welcoming the less-than-perfect child we also abandon the child's mother. If we fail to offer our support we share in the guilt of her abortion.

It is time for society to assess its attitudes toward abortion, a process that demands both honesty and sacrifice. The Church is in a unique position to provide leadership in this area, as it has done since the Supreme Court legalized abortion on demand in 1973. The Church's compassion for the individual in crisis, tempered with truth, has saved many lives.

We need to be challenged to take a long, hard look at how we fit into the abortion picture. We need to hear priests speak about the issue, and we need their support for our efforts to find answers to serious social problems. Laypeople need to roll up their sleeves and be there when it counts, providing shelter, instruction, time, and prayer to the lost and lonely.

We have great resources in talent and technique to draw on, but our greatest strengths are the sacraments. Those of us who have been restored to the sacraments know that even if things look dark or disoriented again, we have found the source of our hope in Christ. Try as we might to fill the void of human alienation with anything else, only one thing will do. The seductive power of abortion cannot stand against that greater love that never rejects the less than perfect of us. It is wonderful to watch someone begin to feel that connectedness. It is even more wonderful to have been a tool helping to build the bridge that made it possible.

POST-ABORTION HEALING

During the past fifteen years many of us resorted to abortion as a last chance out of a personal problem. It didn't solve our problems, but created long-term problems of its own we are only now beginning to face. In recent years facing those problems has become a little easier with post-abortion healing programs across our country. Individuals, women and men, with abortion experiences have sought each other out to discuss their private pain and anguish over a wrong and irreversible decision. Names like American Victims of Abortion, Women Exploited By Abortion, Open Arms, and Post Abortion Counseling and Education are familiar in many cities now.

One of the fastest growing programs today is a Catholic approach to healing abortion's hurt that is sometimes called Project Rachel. At the heart of the program is the sacrament of reconciliation. Often developed under the aegis of the diocesan Respect Life or Family Life office, these programs involve a team approach to the healing experience. Teams consisting of priests, professional counselors and lay peers provide a powerful opportunity to help hurting individuals encounter God's healing love and to welcome the alienated home.

The healing process from abortion is much the same as it is for any other death experience. What often makes the process more difficult is the delay time involved in a woman's strong cases of responsibility for her child's death. Once denial has broken down and she begins to deal with her pain, anger, and despair, she needs a safe place to explore these feelings. The same is true of the father or other persons involved in an abortion.

The reaction that greets an individual trying to communicate her frustration and pain will determine how well she copes with the healing journey. Often the problems that initially lead someone to seek help are not immediately or clearly attached to an abortion event. So powerful is the violence of abortion that problems of abuse, sexual dysfunction, relationship difficulties, sleep disorders and other forms of distress often are caused by a long-buried abortion memory.

As people start to deal with their pain, the most difficult issue to resolve is their sense of self-worth. Especially in mothers there is a great sense of failure in not having protected their children. Remembering that they paid someone to do this to their bodies

and their children is crushing. Women with a Christian or Catholic background often feel that the deed is so detestable that they don't deserve forgiveness—not from themselves, not from their Church, not from God. They need to hear from the Church about forgiveness for abortion.

Often entire families become involved in the healing process. Learning to forgive all those involved in an abortion is vital. All involved with that mother and child need to release any bitterness and frustration that may linger towards the parties they feel are responsible for the act. For example, the woman must forgive her doctor, the baby's father (whatever his role), her parents even if they weren't actively involved, sometimes even the baby who has raised a kind of anger. But the person she has the hardest time forgiving is herself.

People working through abortion grief often express concern about what happened to their child or grandchild. They need to create a bond between themselves and that baby. Women may want to name their baby, even feel with certainty they know the sex of the child. They may also seek forgiveness from their child. Journals and letters may be written to verbalize these feelings.

In the Catholic Church the doctrine of the communion of saints provides some consolation for this ache. A practice gaining favor with those involved in post-abortion ministry is a Eucharistic celebration commemorating the memory of the baby. For many it is an act of closure to the reconciliation and mourning process.

In truth, because abortion is a death experience the healing never really stops. In some corner of that person's heart, mind and soul, that child will always be there. We can never forget, but we can be restored. The lessons we learned were bitter to say the least, but in not forgetting we are truly free from being prey to the same seductions again.

Some will choose to work actively in the pro-life movement, a decision to be made cautiously but one full of rewards. Others will return to their usual lives, but with a new sense of value for the gift of life that comes from God. Either way God's will is done, as it should have been from the beginning.

Understanding brings new hope, and hope promises a brighter future for all of us. We must commit ourselves to better answers and work for them now—for the children and for each other.

PROJECT RACHEL

"During the 1970s, those working in the pro-life field became aware of a special group of hurting women—those who had experienced abortion."

Perhaps because of the Church's vocal opposition to abortion, few were turning to the Church for help or counseling.

Tentatively, dioceses began to address the problem especially in terms of helping Catholic women and others involved in abortion to reconcile with themselves, with their Church and with their God. Thus began efforts such as the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis' Post-Abortion Counseling Program, the Buffalo Diocese's Puzzle Project, the counseling program sponsored by the Diocese of Youngstown, and others. These slightly different efforts in different parts of the country all had the same purpose: to help women and men involved in abortion to experience the healing forgiveness of God.

Today many dioceses have such programs, and most are now known by the name of Project Rachel.

Project Rachel was begun in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee in 1984. Archdiocesan Pro-Life Director Vicki Thorn invited all the priests of the archdiocese to a special program designed to teach them to reach out to people whose lives had been touched by abortion: aborted women, fathers of aborted children, parents and grandparents, other family members and close friends. The program included a discussion of canon law on abortion as well as ways to facilitate the healing process. Social workers from Catholic Social Services and women who had experienced abortion also helped in the training.

Post-abortion counseling is a painful ministry, but most priests report that it is a deeply rewarding experience. The rewards of helping people to heal are obvious, but the unexpected discovery for most is seeing how powerfully God works in our lives.

Today Project Rachel flourishes in many dioceses in the United States and has been established in other countries as well.

THE AFRICAN CONDITION AND PAN-AFRICAN UNITY: THE ROLE OF BLACK AMERICANS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention the remarks made by Chief Bashorun M.K.O. Abiola of Nigeria. Chief Abiola addressed the Organization of African Unity on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Organization of African Unity on May 28, 1988 in Washington, DC. I believe my colleagues will find the remarks of Chief Abiola interesting and thought provoking.

I am delighted and honored to be invited to address you this evening on this auspicious occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Organization of African Unity. My task shall be threefold: To analyze the African condition, to examine the role of black Americans in Africa's economic development, and finally to proffer my own views on how we can address the African condition. When African heads of state met in 1963 to ratify the O.A.U. charter they were under no illusions that the path to pan African unity was going to be a smooth one indeed. Nor were they under the illusion that the organization was going to offer a panacea to Africa's seemingly intractable problems.

For those of you who are students of African political history, you will recall that what became the final charter of the O.A.U. was the product of a compromise between two major ideological and philosophical blocks which were euphemistically called the Cassablanca and Monrovia groups. The Cassablanca group had become associated with an ideological perspective which called for a radical approach to pan-Africanism. Africa's erstwhile leaders such as Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Modibo Keita of Mali, Gamel Abdel Nasser of Egypt, and Sekou Toure of Guinea had taken the position that the path to true independence for Africa must be preceded by a strategy which

placed a premium on political unification of the entire continent. In other words, the nascent African States were to surrender their individual sovereignty to the larger objective of a continental government. They saw this as a precursor of greater things to come, such as integrated economic planning, a common defense strategy, and a common foreign policy for Africa. Nkrumah had warned that "I can see no security for African States unless African leaders, like ourselves, have realized beyond all doubt that salvation for Africa lies in unity * * * for in unity lies strength and as I see it, African States must unite or sell themselves out to imperialist and colonialist exploiters for a mess of pottage, or disintegrate individually."

How ominous a warning!

The Monrovia group had taken a different if less ambitious philosophical approach toward the issue of pan African unity. While committed to African unity. It sought to place emphasis on economic associations and structures which did not violate the sanctity of the sovereignty of individual states.

In spite of these differences in approach, the imperatives of African unity were so overriding that the two groups reconciled their differences, and in the spirit of the African traditional heritage of political consensus, the O.A.U. was born. It was an eloquent testimony to the fact that "where there is a will, there is a way." It was also a tribute to the genius of the leadership skills of the founding fathers of the organization that despite the imperfections of the chapter, that at the very least the African continent needed a supra-structural organization, one which could provide avenues for the discussion and perhaps the solutions to the same problems.

As we take a glimpse into history and celebrate this occasion, we must seize the opportunity to indulge in a critical introspection of the African condition. As we get ready to march into the twenty-first century. This should also be an occasion for frankness and a no-holds-barred discussion. If for no other reason, we should realize that the solution to Africa's problems must come through the collective efforts of peoples of Africa and the African Diaspora.

I hope that thus far, that I have not given the impression that I have adopted a narrow vision of pan African unity by discussing it in the context of the African continent alone. We cannot ignore the historical fact that the architects of Pan-Africanism were the giants and the visionaries of the twentieth century in the likes of W.E. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, Henry Sylvester Williams, and George Padmore. I hope to return to their vision of a transcontinental unity later on in this presentation as I address the challenges that face all of us in the coming years.

THE AFRICAN CONDITION

The African condition is replete with paradoxes; these are paradoxes that need not be. It is a continent richly endowed with human and mineral resources, yet at the bottom wrung of economic development, by whatever indicators we choose to offer our prognosis. It is a continent that produces what it does not consume and consumes what it does not produce. It is a continent which is the cradle of mankind and yet the least habitable for mankind due to environmental and man-made condition. It remains marginal in the geo-political and economic power play in the global arena. The continent is still wracked by incessant political turmoil at proportions and frequencies that

militate against human and material development. The balkanization of Africa into fifty odd states remains an ever present obstacle to national integration and a pan African unity. I submit that the issue of Africa's fragmentation into these lilliputian entities presents Africa with one of its major challenges. We really cannot overemphasize the magnitude of this problem as we engage in our festivities today.

I have engaged in the aforementioned analysis not from the perspective of a pessimist or that of a detached observer. I approach this from the perspective that we cannot begin to engage in appropriate discourse of how to overcome the myriad of socio-political and economic problems of Africa unless we, in a forthright manner, intellectually and psychologically predispose ourselves to meaningful diagnosis of what these problems are. We must as of necessity delineate those problems that are externally induced and those that are master minded from within. Otherwise, we may continually indulge in an orgy of scapegoating that does not lead us anywhere.

At this juncture I would like to focus my attention on sectoral analysis of the African condition after which I will proceed to offer my own humble perspectives on what must be done to alleviate the untold miseries which have befallen millions of Africans presently. I do not intend to rehearse the dismal conditions in which we presently find ourselves; since these are issues which you all know too well. My preliminary remarks are intended to put in perspective my subsequent comments. I wish to characterize these sectoral issues as crises. This choice of words is intended to amplify the urgency of these issues rather than to set an alarm in motion.

THE CRISIS OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

In an attempt to stress the urgency of this crisis Kwame Nkrumah admonished his African compatriots to "seek ye first the political kingdom." Though laden with Biblical overtones, it is an admonition that that has ominous dimensions and one that has to be taken seriously. In the same vein, Ali Mazrui has aptly observed, "A majority of post-colonial African countries hover in a balancing act between the chasm of anarchy and the brink of tyranny. The contradictions of colonial rule and the destruction of Africa's own indigenous structures have left the continent a prey of the forces of concentration of power, on one side, and the forces of disintegration of authority, on the other." Put differently, the prevalent political climate in the continent is one that does not encourage the development of enduring political culture and institutions, nor is it conducive to the development of the economic and social structures. This climate does not lend itself to the building and nurturing of political values of selfless public service and productivity. Most public institutions are dysfunctional and in a state of atrophy. We are yet to deal in any meaningful way with the fissiparous tendencies of African politics which tend to manifest themselves in religious or ethnic dimensions with concomitant destructive outcomes.

We must therefore seek ways and means to arrest the situation which I have referred to above. We must seriously address ourselves to finding alternative paths to this malaise. These alternative paths must include the issues of political leadership, new political values, alternative political structures institutions etc. All this is to say that the imperatives of the African condition

demand that we create an enduring political environment which will allow for internal development while at the same time providing a conducive climate for attracting positive foreign investment. This is part of my challenge to all of us.

THE ECONOMICS CRISIS

Within the rubric of Africa's economic crisis are a host of causally related issues. It must include the following: the food crisis, the debt crisis, population explosion, infrastructural decay and slow growth of the economy to mention just a few. An analysis of the aforementioned suggests that the problems are multi-dimensional in scope and ramifications. They are as structural as they are a reflection of the paucity of policy options and strategies. In other words, the economic crisis must have a multifaceted approach which understands the relationships between domestic economies and the global economy, that is, the interconnections between various sectors of the political, social, and economic fabric of the African society. The challenge, therefore, is to undertake a meaningful analysis of these subsectors with a view of re-routing the present course which leads us nowhere but to an economic abyss.

Let us examine the debt issue which is fast becoming an intractable problem. Africa's foreign debts have grown exponentially in the last decade. Besides the enormity of this debt (measured in raw figures and the ratio of the debt to total revenues). There is also the question of the debt service burden which has created a serious drain on the resources of most African States. Even the much vaunted middle income countries are not immune to the problem. It is quite obvious to most of us that this problem cannot be allowed to continue unabated. There is a famous English adage which instructs us that "he who pays the piper, calls the tune." This adage suggests to us that unless the debt crisis is alleviated, Africa will remain hostage to its external creditors with the attendant implication of making a mockery of the precarious sovereignty which we presently enjoy.

POPULATION ISSUE

In the same vein, we cannot underestimate the enormity of the population explosion which is wreaking havoc on the limited resources and fragile infrastructure of most African States. While the population problem does not account for most of Africa's problems, it does, nevertheless, compound an already strained economy. The population problem is very much related to the food crisis. This is a fundamental issue. As a matter of fact, it is a matter of survival. The food crisis is an offspring of manmade and ecological factors. I see the food crisis as one of those paradoxes that need not be. Available evidence suggests that even with Africa's environmental vicissitudes, the problem is largely a function of misplaced priorities and shortsightedness on the part of many African States. This trend toward dependency on external sources to feed Africa's populations, starvation, and malnutrition can and must be reversed immediately. Time is not an ally of Africa. We obviously do not have the luxury of procrastination or inaction. I do not wish to imply that the environment does not contribute its own share to the food crisis. Even then, those ecological factors that can be alleviated through education, governmental actions, and other means need not be delayed.

REFUGEE PROBLEM

Any discussion on the food crisis cannot receive adequate analysis if we do not concomitantly address the refugee problem in Africa. The chilling fact that Africa has nearly half of the world's refugees cries for a concerted effort on the part of citizens of Africa and the world to seek immediate solutions while there is still time to act. The situation calls for Africa's leaders to redress the human causes of the refugee problem. While conceding that natural disasters have contributed to the refugee problem, I dare say that we can go a long way toward alleviating this human misery if only the leaders of African States can learn to live in peace with one another; i.e. in an environment that does not resort to war to settle disputes amongst brothers and sisters. The scope of the task that lies ahead should make it obvious that the present course must not continue. It does not make sense to me that African States are preoccupied with conflicts that drain the limited resources available for economic and social development. It is mind boggling that we should engage in senseless wars with weapons which we do not even produce. Such is the nature of our predicament.

THE SOCIAL CRISIS

Perhaps at the heart of the socio-cultural crisis is the need to decolonize the African mind and stir it toward the direction of re-Africanisation and disalienation. I start from the premise that one of the factors responsible for Africa's dependency on the West is the spectre of cultural alienation by those Africans who are in a position to direct the course of affairs in the continent and in the Diaspora. What will it mean in concrete terms? Put in the context of the African Diaspora in general, it is becoming fashionable to disassociate ourselves from our African heritage. We must come to accept who we are with pride and aplomb. You may wish to ask what is the relevance of this admonition in the scheme of things? It is paramount that we find the solutions to our worldwide predicament within ourselves. It is imperative that for our brothers and sisters in the Americas that they anchor their essence in their African heritage. It is an inescapable reality. For the Africans in the continent, it is also an imperative that we eschew our tendency toward westernization at all costs. What is required then is a cultural revolution of the mind by Africans in and outside the Diaspora; to commit themselves to a revival of the African spirit and personality which will embolden us to believe that we have the wherewithal to surmount the challenges which we currently have to contend with. We must heed the admonitions of our erstwhile predecessors such as Edward Blyden, W.E. Dubois, Kwame Nkrumah, George Padmore, Marcus Garvey, and Aime Cesaire that we must undo the perniciousness of cultural imperialism which continues to stand in the way of our self fulfillment.

To this end, we must address ourselves to the relevance and meaning of the education which we acquire and consequently transmit to the younger generation of Africans. We should ask ourselves whether the present education which we receive aid or abets the self fulfillment which I have referred to earlier. On this same issue Edward Blyden declared as far back as 1881 in his inaugural address as president of Liberia College that "the college is only a machine, an instrument to assist in carrying forward our regular work-devised not only for intellectual ends, but for social purposes, for religious

duty, for patriotic aims, for racial development, and when as an instrument; as a means, it fails, for any reason whatever; to fulfill its legitimate functions, it is the duty, as well as the interest of the country, to see that it is stimulated into healthful activity; or, if this is impossible, to see that it is set aside as a pernicious obstruction."

These words are as relevant today as they were when they were spoken over a hundred years ago.

We must undertake to cultivate a culture of productivity rather than a culture of consumption; a culture of self sustenance rather than a culture of dependency; a culture of selfless devotion to the service of the common good rather than a penchant for individual aggrandizement. These are not novel attributes; for they represent the essence of the African personality to which we must commit to revive and nurture. It is in this spirit that we enhance the symbiotic existence among the peoples of African descent throughout the universe.

I wish to return to one of the major themes of this paper which is to examine the role of African-Americans in Pan-African unity and African economic development in the coming decades. As a matter of historical fact, the idea of pan African unity at its most dynamic juncture was given immense impetus by W.E. Dubois. Through his leadership of five pan-Africanist congresses, which reached a peak and point of historic excellence during the fifth pan-Africanist congress in Manchester, England in 1945. His global approach to the plight of the people of the African continent and in the African Diaspora led to his assertion that the freedom of black Americans was inextricably linked with the freedom of Africa. As an extension of this perspective, he declared that "we American negroes should know that, until Africa is free, the descendants of Africa the world over cannot escape their chains. The NAACP should therefore put in the forefront of its program the freedom of Africa in work and wage, education and health, and the complete abolition of the colonial system."

Dubois lit a torch which his disciples carried to greater heights throughout the African Diaspora and in the African continent to embark on a path of liberation and freedom.

We also must not forget the contributions of Marcus Garvey in giving further impetus to the idea of pan-African unity with a global perspective. The challenge was how to translate this noble aspiration to concrete reality. I must mention that the fire of African nationalism and the push toward decolonization which was lit by the pan-Africanist movement became responsible in part for posing in an ironic sense one of the major obstacles to the dream of a pan-African society. I am specifically referring to the issue of individual sovereignty, a matter which seems to have introverted the disposition of African leaders toward guarding their parochial interests all so jealously. If African States continue to treat the issue of individual sovereignty as an inviolate and sacred commodity, I am afraid that the goal of pan-African unity will become a romantic idea only to be relegated to a mere nostalgic concept. I believe that we owe it to the forefathers of pan-Africanism to prevent this phenomenon from becoming a reality.

I am, however, encouraged and elated by a series of events that have taken place in the United States especially in the last few years with regard to the role of black Americans in United States foreign policy toward

South Africa in particular and Africa in general. Thanks to the massive involvement of the masses of black America: the Congressional Black Caucus, and Trans-Africa, etc., it was possible to get through the United States Congress sanctions against the apartheid regime of South Africa, albeit toothless, yet symbolic.

THE ROLE OF BLACK AMERICANS

What must black Americans do to change the course of American foreign policy toward Africa in the coming years? It is a reality of history that Africans in the continent are estranged through the ignominious era of trans-Atlantic slavery. It is also a matter of historical reality that this physical estrangement cannot be undone. But it is my opinion that the barriers imposed by geography can be overcome and bridged through symbiotic endeavors if we heed the eloquent advice of the forefathers of the pan-Africanist movement that the fate of continental and non-continental Africans are inextricably bound spiritually and materially.

EMPOWERMENT OF BLACK AFRICANS

As residents and citizens of the world's major superpower with the wherewithal to build and destroy, the political, social, and economic empowerment of black Americans will augur well for the African continent if the production of such empowerment translates into a new direction for American foreign policy toward Africa. My hope and belief is that this new direction will definitely help in improving the crises which I discussed earlier. It will usher in an era in which the United States no longer treats African issues and concerns with insensitivity and sometimes contempt. It will usher an era of even-handedness in the policy options and actions of the United States toward Africa whether it be in the matter of economic development, technical assistance or the question of apartheid in South Africa. Political clout for black Americans will help to ensure that issues and concerns dear to Africans are not subject to hypocritical and contradictory analysis.

I would like to use the issue of apartheid as an illustration of what I mean. The system of apartheid presents the world with one of its most heinous systems that should jolt the human conscience regardless of race, creed, color, nationality, or national boundaries. Not only has the United States been extremely insensitive to the aspirations of millions of Africans and black Americans on the South African problem, but I dare say that the policy of constructive engagement is a misguided policy which does not coincide with the views of the rest of the world and especially those of the Africans. We are told that the United States does not support sanctions against the Pretoria regime on the grounds that they do not work and that they will bring untold hardships to the masses of the South Africans. But, I am reminded that sanctions have been applied by the United States in Cuba, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Iran, etc. It is this sort of contradiction which I alluded to earlier.

When we examine the entire gamut of American foreign policy toward Africa in historical context and note the paucity of such a policy, I become increasingly convinced that significant changes need to occur in a more positive direction. It also becomes paramently clear that black Americans can and must exercise tremendous clout on behalf of Africa in the same manner that Jewish Americans exercise

enormous, almost, veto power on matters affecting Israel. I see the makings of this clout in the political gains that have been made by black elected officials and the black electorate. These strides must be harnessed.

While still on this issue, I must add that the empowerment to which I refer can be enhanced and aided when African States themselves begin to seriously deal with the numerous crises which I discussed earlier. It will foster the symbiotic relationship which is so necessary to foster a mutually beneficial enterprise. A strong Africa can also use its clout to exercise influence on America on matters of major concerns to black America. In essence, what I am saying is that a weak Africa is of no significant value to black America. It bears repeating that the imperative of mutual self-interest cannot be over-emphasized. I cannot say enough about this issue especially as the turn of the next century fast approaches.

The private sector in Africa is relatively underdeveloped. It is a sector that must shoulder the major responsibility of alleviating Africa's economic crisis. Events have proven that the concentration of the future of Africa in the public sector is very flawed. The public sector does not have the capacity nor the means to shoulder the enormous responsibility of economic development. This is an arena where the entrepreneurial skills and know-how of Black Americans can be of invaluable benefit to African States. To this end African States must adopt policies which aggressively encourage this participation in all facets of the economy; transmission of technical and professional skills and technological transfer to those areas of the socio-economic sector in most need.

Those people involved in the private sector must also embark on a program that similarly involves the badly needed entrepreneurial skills of black Americans in the solution of Africa's economic crisis.

If I have sounded rather blunt and somewhat abrasive, I crave your indulgence; for as I stated at the outset, we must take advantage of this occasion for introspection, to reevaluate our course of action and rededicate ourselves to play our individual and collective roles in improving the lot of our fellow Africans. The African past is replete with noble accomplishments and history, but we must be committed to bequeathing a future to the young generation of Africans which will certainly be more prosperous than ours.

CONCLUSION

In concluding, I would like to restate my personal views about the tasks and challenges that confront the African continent and the Diaspora. We need not delude ourselves about the complexity of our situation—those we inherited and those that are self-inflicted. The burden is heavy, the responsibilities are gigantic and the solutions are tenuous and even elusive sometimes. I dare say also that some of the answers may lie outside our capacity to influence or control. However as an eternal optimist—not a naive one—we must create new realities within the limits of our capabilities; guided by unbounded dreams and aspirations in the context of the African personality.

Having said all these, I wish to suggest the following:

(a) That African States must rekindle the aspirations of forging a new political order; one which seeks to overcome the burden of Africa's fragmentation. This goal must transcend simple populist rhetoric of the yester-

years. The masterminds of the Berlin Conference are forging ahead toward European integration. It behooves us therefore to borrow a chapter from Europe. The survival of Africa in the coming decades depends a great deal on whether we heed the admonitions of Kwame Nkrumah which I cited earlier.

This option will require that African leaders must have the much needed vision and fortitude to understand the deleterious consequences of continuing to maintain the sanctity of present territorial borders and the sanctity of individual sovereignty.

(b) That the structure of the organization of African unity needs radical changes to meet the challenges of the world which we presently live in. The O.A.U. continues to provide the skeletal avenues for a continental unity. It remains an indispensable body. However, in its present form, it is inadequate to provide the basis for political and economic integration; such as is the case with the European community.

(c) That we must begin to seriously deal with the language problem which has continued to exacerbate the perniciousness of mutually re-inforcing cleavages throughout the continent of Africa. I do not wish to discuss the details of this proposition.

(d) That a highly representative body of the black American community and the African continent must set up a permanent body charged with the responsibility on an on-going basis, to coordinate economic, social, political and cultural policies that are of mutual benefit. I might add that this proposition should as of necessity include all other areas of the African Diaspora. In a sense, this body would then serve as a loose confederation which will help to bridge the gulf created by hundreds of years of physical estrangement.

(e) That Africa's debt crisis must be resolved with the immediacy which it deserves in order to avoid the potential of throwing an already embattled economy into a tail spin. It is also important that African States meet their international obligations to their creditors for the sake of maintaining credibility and solvency.

In closing, I would like to thank the organizers of this event for allowing me the privilege of addressing this assembly. Will you please join me and the rest of millions of Africans in and outside the continent in dedicating ourselves to creating a new world order in which all human beings regardless of race, creed, color, or nationality will be able to live in peace, harmony, and prosperity. Long live Africa! Long live the rest of mankind!

BERNARD LANDMAN, JR., ON
PUBLIC HOUSING

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1988

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Bernard Landman, Jr., is one of Indiana's most distinguished lawyers because of his scholarship and plain talk. The following is an example, a quick and clear course on Federal housing legislation:

NOR SHALL PRIVATE PROPERTY BE TAKEN FOR PUBLIC USE, WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION¹

(By Bernard Landman, Jr.)

The Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987² declares a moratorium on the prepayment of existing mortgage notes insured by the Federal Housing Administration under Sections 221(d)(3) and 236 of the National Housing Act. This moratorium is proclaimed legislatively, notwithstanding the fact that such mortgage notes contain a specific clause permitting prepayment on and after twenty (20) years from the date of Final Endorsement of the mortgage note by the Federal Housing Commissioner.

The action attempted by the Congress in this legislation is the culmination of the death knell of multifamily housing debt by the people's representatives. The killing which, left unchecked and unchallenged, is about to result in not only an illegal, but an immoral, act.

I grew up in a generation that loved and respected its country and its government. In a world of good and evil, we represented "good." We had justice and morality on our side. Putting aside the legal question for the moment, it is painful, therefore, when the government of the United States, through the elected representatives of the people, attempts to openly, blatantly, legislate a breach of contract.

In 1961 the Congress passed the first piece of housing legislation that provided for private industry to create a housing stock for low and moderate income families.³ Prior to the enactment of this legislation, that housing was provided by state and local municipalities through public housing financed by federal grants and loans.⁴ The historic legislation in 1961 was very simple and inexpensive to the federal government. It provided that in exchange for making housing available to low and moderate income families, as defined in the legislation, and accepting a reduced return on equity, the government would make available forty (40) year loans at "the annual rate of interest determined, from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury at the request of the Commissioner, by estimating the average market yield to maturity on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States, and by adjusting such yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percentum. . . ."⁵

Since the federal government paid the lowest interest rate available to anyone, the rate changed was substantially "below market" and hence, the projects built with these funds became known as 221(d)(3) below market interest rate projects or "BMIRs." In 1965, because of the gradual rise in the government borrowing rate (from 3% to 3.75%), Congress fixed the rate at the lower of the annual borrowing rate of the United States and 3%⁶ and thus began to subsidize these projects through real expenditures rather than simply lending its credit rating to the project. Because the interest rate was below market, the loans were bought by a government agency (then called Federal National Mortgage Association and

¹ Article V, Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

² Public Law 100-242, Title II, Subtitle B.

³ Public Law 87-70, Section 101(a)(11), 75 Stat. 149, 152.

⁴ The U.S. Housing Act of 1937, Public Law 93-383, Title II, Section 201.

⁵ *Ibid*, note 3.

⁶ Public Law 89-117, Section 102(b), 79 Stat. 451, 454.

now called Government National Mortgage Association) rather than a private lender.

In 1968,⁷ when the federal budget was being squeezed by the Vietnam conflict, the budget "manipulators" found that it would substantially improve the deficit if the low and moderate income loans were not bought by a government agency (thus creating a charge of the total loan to the budget), but were bought by a private mortgagee, the federal government only guaranteed the difference between the "market interest rate" and the "below market" interest rate. By doing this, magically, the charge to the budget was reduced from the entire loan to one year's subsidized interest.

In order to improve the program the government increased the interest subsidy. Instead of a 3% interest rate, the government subsidized the interest down to 1% and also paid itself the FHA insurance premium of 1/2 of 1%. Thus, in a master stroke, the government reduced the budget charge, on an annual basis, from about \$15,000 per housing unit to about \$1,050 per unit (never mind that this latter amount, on a reducing basis continued for up to forty (40) years while the \$15,000 was a one time charge recoverable, at 3% interest over up to forty (40) years). If nothing else, this legislation should make us suspicious of all government accounting and government waste. This new program, known as Section 236 of the National Housing Act, superseded Section 221(d)(3) BMIR and became the primary subsidized housing program until 1974. As inflation increased so did the expenses in operating these subsidized projects. Since there was no subsidy for operating costs, but only for financing costs, the additional operating costs had to be absorbed through increased rents. Some subsidized projects were built in poor locations (many cities did not want them in "good" locations), some were mismanaged and many either were not able to charge the tenants increased rents because (i) FHA was either slow (or refused) to approve increased rents or (ii) the tenants were unable to pay the approved increased rents. In any event, the FHA insurance fund suffered substantial losses which resulted in the termination of future use of the Section 236 program.⁸

The Nixon administration recommended replacing Section 236 within nine months after that termination with a new program under Section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937⁹ which subsequently became the most costly subsidy program in the history of housing: Section 8 of the Housing Act of 1937.¹⁰ Between inflation, rising interest costs and the automatic rent adjustment factor, this program took subsidized housing from an innovative, but "No cost" program in 1961 to an average cost to the government of \$1900.00 per unit in 1983. In that year, therefore, Congress, at the request of the Administration, killed the goose.¹¹ While it approved a voucher program, giving housing vouchers to low income families, no housing stock for low income families has been built since 1984.¹²

except for a limited number of elderly apartment units built by nonprofit corporations under Section 202 of the National Housing Act.

As set forth earlier, the projects built by "for profit" sponsors under each of these programs (221(d)(3), 236 and Section 8) contained a ticking bomb. In order to induce the sponsor to build the project, the FHA, in its regulations¹³ and in the insured note, required a provision preventing prepayment for twenty (20) year after Final Endorsement but permitted prepayment thereafter.¹⁴ The end of the twenty (20) year prepayment lock out is rapidly approaching. Obviously, it was intended that subsidized housing would be an ongoing government program. Sponsors, twenty years ago, believed that either their projects would be worth far more (and therefore sold at a profit without restrictions) or that they could be converted to cooperatives or condominiums for low income families to the benefit of the low income family and the financial benefit of the owner.

The tax laws were geared to a sale after between twelve and eighteen years (depending on the year in which the project was originally built) and no sponsor actually intended to hold the project after twenty years (much less retain it for low income tenants). In any event, every "for profit" sponsor of a low income subsidized project believed he had the obligation to maintain the project as a low income project for twenty (20) years and the contractual right to prepay the loan after twenty (20) years.

However, Congress had not kept faith with the low and moderate income population. In 1983 it terminated the only existing program that substantially increased the available housing stock annually. In order to attempt to lessen the effect of its bad faith, the Congress proposes to breach its contract with the existing housing owners and prevent the prepayment of the outstanding loans.

It may be, that based upon current conditions, few owners will want to prepay their loans. That is not the issue. Whether the loan is or is not prepaid is solely an option of the owner. To attempt to prevent the exercise of that option, to attempt to eliminate that option, is both immoral and illegal.

It is immoral because regardless of any well-meaning, righteous or self-righteous reasons, the government should not break its word. If we cannot rely upon the word of the government, then why should any of us honor our contracts, keep our word or act in a predictable manner? It is not the project owners who have created—or may create—a shortage of low income housing. It is not the project owners who have caused a mon-

umental budget deficit. It is not the project owners who have caused a substantial trade deficit. These have all been caused by the Congress and the Administration. Neither should have the right to attempt to rectify their errors at the expense of the project owners.

It is illegal for much the same reason that it is immoral. While the constitutional prohibition against interference with the right of contract ostensibly applies only to the states, the federal government is prohibited from taking property without due process of law. By preventing the prepayment of the mortgage has the federal government "taken property?" Certainly the prepayment option is a property right. However, it is argued, the owner still owns the project. The owner still collects the rent. While the owner is denied the right to increase the rents, obtain a higher profit or sell the project for increased profits, the owner has the same rights he had prior to prepayment of the mortgage.

Not only does that argument fall of its own weight, but it must be viewed in the very subtle light of our complex society. One of the inducements given to the project sponsor at the time he agreed to build the project, was a substantial tax advantage. While the return on investment was limited, the tax law made the project more valuable by permitting the owner (and the investors) to defer income tax otherwise due on other income of the owner or investor. The tax was not eliminated, it was deferred.

The day of reckoning is now here and the project that generated more loss than income in the early years now generates more taxable income than real income in these years. The owner contemplated selling the project at a profit to pay these accruing taxes.

In 1986 the Congress enacted the 1986 Tax Reform Act which, among other things, denies the use of tax losses generated from real estate to be used to offset other "non-passive" or portfolio income. The buyers of property for "tax losses" therefore no longer exist. Only projects which are "economically" feasible are saleable. But certainly a project for low income tenants which generates, basically, a 6% return on equity (computed 11.11% of the original mortgage) is not economically feasible. Therefore, from an economic standpoint unless the owner can prepay the mortgage he does not have an economically feasible property to sell. His economic loss, in real dollars, both in lost profits and in additional taxes, is substantial.

Both Congress and HUD have proposed a series of incentives to be offered to owners to retain their projects as low income projects.¹⁵ These include: second mortgages, increase in the dividend percentage and increase in the base on which the dividend is computed.

As previously indicated, many owners may not wish to prepay the mortgage (although how such owner will handle the income tax problem for himself and his investors is unknown). Some owners may well determine that one or more of the foregoing incentives is worth extending the prepayment restriction. (Certainly Congress and HUD should offer such incentives in any case where they feel it would be advisable if the mortgage was not prepaid.) However, in each case the owner should be free to accept or reject such incentives and to prepay or not prepay

¹³ 24 CFR 221.524 and 236.30.

¹⁴ The authority for this regulation is set forth in the applicable statutes.

Section 221(d) states:

"(d) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) . . . contain such terms and provisions with respect to . . . anticipation of maturity . . .

"(e) . . .

"(2) The Commissioner may at the time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the mortgage from his liability under the mortgage . . ."

Section 236(h) states:

"(h) . . . (T)he Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations, to enter into such agreements, and to adapt such procedures as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this section."

⁷ Public Law 90-448, Section 201, 82 Stat. 476, 498.

⁸ Order of January 8, 1973, of James F. Lynn, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

⁹ Nixon's Housing Proposals to Congress, September 19, 1973 (See Housing Development Reporter Vol. 1, No. 10, September 19, 1973, pages L-1 et seq.

¹⁰ Public Law 93-383, Title II, Section 201, 88 Stat. 653 (August 22, 1974).

¹¹ Public Law 98-181, Section 209, 97 Stat. 1159.

¹² Except, of course, those projects approved prior to November 30, 1983 but commenced thereafter.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, note 2.

the mortgage as he determines of his own free will.

Another serious problem exists, that neither Congress nor HUD seem to have even considered. In 1981, Congress enacted new tax legislation which, for depreciation purposes, removed any distinction between "new" and "used" properties.¹⁶ As a result a number of subsidized projects were sold by the then existing owners to new owners who bought the projects for the tax advantages which existed under the Internal Revenue Code as then written.

The vast majority of the projects were appraised on the basis that at the end of the prepayment restriction period they would be sold as non-subsidized projects at the then market rate for rents; a cash payment was made at the time of transfer and a note given for the balance of the purchase price payable at or within a reasonable time after the expiration of the prepayment restriction. As the prepayment restriction period nears, the new owners must sell the projects, without income or rent restrictions, in order to find a buyer who considers the project "economically" feasible, and to use the proceeds to pay the note to the original seller. Failure to pay the note to the original seller will, in almost all in-

stances, result in a reversion of the project to the original owner and a loss by the new owner of his investment. (This new owner is, incidentally, the same owner that the Congress severely and unjustly penalized in the Tax Reform Act of 1986 by eliminating, over a period of five (5) years the tax advantages that existed at the time of purchase by the new owner and which he thought he was getting when he acquired the project.)

Thus in two years, the Congress will have (1) substantially reduced the value that the new owner thought he was acquiring and (2) caused the actual loss of the same project by preventing the sale of the project and thus causing the default on the note given to the original owner and consequently the reversion of the project to the original owner.

Housing is, and will continue to be, one of the basic requirements of Americans. The history of government action in both subsidized and non-subsidized housing is erratic and therefore, in many respects, more harmful than helpful. The treatment by Congress of the housing industry has been abominable. We need a new housing policy which is not so expensive that it must be discontinued in a short period of time but, at the same time, recognizes that housing, particularly for low income families, requires the expenditure of public funds. We

need a housing policy that does not favor an industry and its investors one day and destroy both the next. We need a housing policy based upon the needs of the public and not the expansive or regressive attitudes and policies of the Congress.

*The purpose of this Article is to discuss the effect that Congress and the Administration have had on housing for low and moderate income families. However, it should be pointed out that the destruction caused by recent legislation is not limited to subsidized housing. Because rents in the United States have not kept pace with operating costs, few multifamily projects have been "economically" feasible for the last ten (10) years. These projects have been built with the additional funding—or subsidy—provided by the tax code which permitted the use of "paper" losses against real income. Without debating the desirability of this subsidy, without it, few multifamily projects can be built. This issue has not been examined in its real impact and its social implications. Instead, the Congress not only ended further housing production, but, for good measure, and solely to make the 1986 Tax Reform Act "revenue neutral," it retroactively withdrew tax advantages previously given to investors in multifamily housing and substantially injured those who had invested in reliance upon prior actions of the Congress. When housing again becomes not only a national problem but a national disgrace, how will the Congress again induce investors to participate in housing construction when such inducements can be suddenly and retroactively withdrawn by the government.

¹⁶Public Law 97-34, Title II, Section 201(a).